

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, January 25, 1966

Meeting called to order at 7:49 P.M. by
Vice-Chairman Kenneth Black.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Black, Bretz, Houston,
Reynolds and Siebert—5.

Absent: Fink, Heino and Manz—3.

HEARINGS

S-27-65

Mr. Thomas W. Newton, Planner, gave
an explanation of the proposed subdivision
of Georgetown Subdivision.

The developer was not present.

Mrs. Helen Schaeffer, 1433 Gilcrest of
East Lansing was in the audience and
asked several questions pertaining to
sewers, schedule of development, and
screening.

Matter was referred to the Streets Com-
mittee.

Z-227-65

Motion by Houston, seconded by Bretz,
that the public hearing for the Community
Unit Plan submitted by Lee Halstead for
property located in the 900-1000 Block
Allegan and 900-1000 Block Washtenaw be
set for Tuesday, March 1, 1966 at 7:30
P.M. in Court Room No. 1 of City Hall.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

BUSINESS SESSION

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that
the minutes of December 7th be approved.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

STREETS COMMITTEE

S-27-65

Motion by Houston, seconded by Siebert
that the Preliminary Plat of Georgetown
Subdivision be approved subject to the
following conditions:

Final Plat to be developed with public
improvements as required by the Michigan
State Plat Act and Lansing Subdivision
Regulations.

Georgetown Subdivision as revised, ap-
proval by City Council of Z-200-65, Com-
munity Unit Plan to which this plat has
been designed.

Approval of the Preliminary Plat is
effective for a maximum period of twelve
months.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Houston, Reynolds
and Siebert—5.

Nays: None.

URBAN RENEWAL

The Secretary informed the board that
an action was before Council to have all
properties not already acquired in the
Urban Renewal Project No. 1 condemned.

Mr. Reynolds remarked that his action
has been tabled for one week for further
investigation. This condemnation would
cut down the time in purchasing.

Mr. Siebert asked about the demolition
proceedings.

ORDINANCE

Mr. Edwin P. Brown gave an explanation
of the apartment zoning density require-
ments.

The Secretary gave the board a copy of
the recommended policy for apartment
zoning.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee for a recommendation on February 1st.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Houston, that a copy of the report issued to the Board members, should be taken up at the next regular meeting.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The Secretary informed the Board of the budget and work program and gave an explanation of same. He further reported that we would have full staff on February 7th. Goals established last year were read, and the board advised that the new budget will be submitted for the meeting on February 1st.

Mr. Black asked if the housing deal should be included in coordinated project time.

Mr. Reynolds advised that there would be 50 houses per site. Most available areas are next to single family.

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Houston, that the board forward a recommendation to the Housing Commission.

The Secretary advised that the same criteria and policies as required for developers would apply to their request.

Mr. Black stated that inasmuch as the staff would be deeply involved all year with this, perhaps it should be included in the work program.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Fink came in at 8:50 P.M.

Recess from 9:02 to 9:40 P.M.

Z-118-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Louis and George Eyde and Thomas F. Kegan to rezone a parcel in the 1500 block of North Waverly described as:

E. 20.45 A. of W. 40.9 A. of that part of N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ lying S. of Grand River exc. S. 980 ft.; Section 7 and

W. 20.45 A. of that part of the N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ lying S. of Grand River exc. S. 980 ft.; Section 7

All in Block 25

from "A" one family residence to "D-M" multiple dwelling district revised on Nov-

ember 10, 1965 to Community Unit Plan be disapproved for the following reasons:

The development is contrary to the established land use pattern of the entire surrounding area which is low density, single family residential development

The develop would alter the population density pattern thereby seriously increasing the load on public facilities.

The plan would create an isolated district unrelated to the adjoining development bearing no relation to the continuity and development pattern of the entire area.

Multiple dwelling use in this area was denied by the Lansing Township Planning Commission because the development did not comply with the provisions of the township's proposed rezoning ordinance which designates the area as "A" residential.

The Ingham County Road Commission states that any access to Waverly Road should be limited to one location. This would not be adequate to serve a multiple family type development.

The development to the east was platted with two stub streets to be extended into this area to handle single family development and eliminate a need for access to Waverly Road, which was at that time recognized as a traffic safety hazard.

Access to Waverly Road from this development with its high density would create an extreme traffic hazard and reduce the traffic carrying capacity of Waverly Road in addition to introducing a considerable amount of additional traffic to the already overloaded intersection of Waverly Road and Willow Street.

There is no substantial reason why the property cannot be used in accordance with the existing zoning, or be developed alternatively as part site compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

The Board in analyzing the proposed Community Unit Plan considered the following:

A. Comprehensiveness:

1. The proposed change is contrary to the established land use.
2. The change will alter the population density pattern and thereby increase the load on public facilities considerably more than the established density of this area would otherwise create.
3. The proposed change is contrary to the Future Land Use Plan which indicates this area as low density single family residential use.

B. Changed conditions:

1. The basic land use conditions have not been changed, and will not conceivably change in the future because of the relatively recent development of this area.
2. The progressive development of the area has not been contrary to existing regulations.

C. Public welfare:

1. The change will create or excessively increase traffic congestion on Waverly Road as well as at the intersection of Willow Street and Waverly Road. The north street entrance must be moved as required by the County Road Commission. The south entrance is not in the City of Lansing. The increased amount of traffic generated by the development will be required to move onto Waverly Road from a single point thereby creating a traffic hazard and reducing traffic-carrying capacity on an already overloaded major thoroughfare and intersection.
2. The change will adversely affect the property values in the adjacent area.
3. The change will constitute a grant of a special privilege to an individual as contrasted to the general welfare.

D. Reasonableness:

1. There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be used in accordance with the existing zoning. The topography is severe along the river and along Waverly Road only. Platting can be achieved with reasonable size lots. The severe areas can be platted with access easements over the lots to the rear as has been done in the area immediately to the east of Ravenswood Subdivision. Similar areas along Moores River Drive have been platted in the same manner.
2. It is not impossible to find adequate sites for the proposed use in areas more desirable for such use.

In addition to this:

The Ingham County Road Commission recommends that access onto Waverly Road should be limited to one location with the north street entrance eliminated due to terrain and proximity to the bridge. The two streets to the east, Springbrook and Briarwood, run dead-end into this property and were so platted with the intent that they would be extended when this area is developed. The proposed plan is not designed for the extension of these streets.

The Public Service Department has advised that the existing pumping station, force main and sanitary sewer outlet were designed for single family development. They further advised that this type of multiple development would seriously overload the sanitary sewer system of the area and recommend that this type of development not be approved.

The Lansing Board of Education has indicated that this area is not in the Lansing School District but since it may some day become part of that district, they question the high density of the area and believe that it should seemingly develop as low density single family.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Houston, Reynolds, and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-188-65

Motion by Houston, seconded by Bretz, that this zoning petition be moved from the table for the purpose of making a determination.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Houston, Reynolds, and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Houston, that the petition by Richard Neller to rezone the property at 6326 South Cedar Street from "A" one family district to Community Unit Plan be tabled for additional information on traffic, public safety, and the Michigan State Highway Report and other information needed, namely:

1. Ownership of excepted parcels.
2. Sq. ft. of proposed commercial area.
3. Ratio of commercial area to parking area.
4. What streets would be dedicated—tentative street plan
5. Density of Multi-family areas.
6. Square feet of proposed office buildings.
7. Lot plan for single family.
8. Status of school site relocation.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Houston, Reynolds, and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Motion by Houston, seconded by Reynolds, that Mr. Bill Roman of Tri-County Regional Planning Commission be allowed to speak.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Roman advised that his staff will be able to furnish technical information as to various streets, particularly trunk lines, however the technical output of the transportation study will not be available for about three or four months. Delhi and Delta are engaged in a planning program with them. The present indication for Delta Township planning area from 1965 to 1985 is that it doesn't include any regional centers.

A written statement will be submitted on or before February 1st.

Mr. Fink read aloud the letter from the Highway Department relative to the intersection of I-96 and Cedar Street.

Messrs. Walter and Richard Neller made some comments.

Mr. Reynolds then asked if these same particular questions would be applicable if this was a neighborhood center rather than a regional shopping center.

The Secretary then stated that the real question boils down to whether or not the city would approve a regional or neighborhood shopping center. We recommend that it is not in the community's interest to approve a regional center at his site.

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Houston, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-200-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Houston, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Eugene F. Seimet of the B. L. Smokler and Co. to rezone a parcel on the South side of Miller and Haag Road described as:

E. $\frac{1}{2}$ of N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ and W. $\frac{1}{2}$ of W. $\frac{1}{2}$ of N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of N.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ N. of N. R/W line I-96 exc. com. 757.25 ft. E. of N. $\frac{1}{2}$ post N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$, thence E. 220 ft., S. 394 ft., W. 220 ft., N. 394 ft. to beg.; Section 8, T3N, R2W

from "A" one family to Community Unit Plan be approved as submitted subject to the following conditions:

1. Final approval of the platting of the property.
2. Receipt, review, and approval by the Board or an on-site pedestrian walkway plan linking the various units within the development.

3. Evidence of satisfactory agreement for the acceptance and purchase of the proposed park and school sited by the Parks Department and the Board of Education respectively.

4. Screening of one of the following types to be provided along the east property line from the north boundary line of the school site to the south R.O.W. line of Miller Road:

- a. A three or four foot high cyclone type fence with dense evergreen plantings of a mature height of six feet.
- b. A six foot high cyclone type fence with interwoven slats.

Dense evergreen and tree plantings are to be provided along the western edge of the development. These plantings are not restricted precisely to the property line, but should be placed in such a manner as to properly screen the complex from future development to the west.

5. An additional 115 parking spaces be provided to maintain a ratio of two parking spaces per dwelling unit.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Houston, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The memo from the City Assessor relative to Assessor's Plats was read, and the matter was referred to the Streets Committee for recommendation on February 1st.

Mr. Houston asked the status of the Community Center Projects, and was informed that meetings are being held with the various agencies delegated to handle this matter, and sites are included in the Capital Improvement Program for 1966-1972 for funding by Federal Funds.

Mr. Reynolds suggested that maybe this was being held up until the low cost housing sites were determined.

Mr. Houston then suggested the city look at the zoning and Master Plan.

Mr. Reynolds stated he felt the low cost housing should not be in the location of Grand River.

Mrs. Bretz stated that consideration should be given to their needs such as public transportation and stores.

Mr. Fink asked if we are going to do the same thing with public housing as with other projects.

Mr. Houston then questioned if part of the \$60,000 allocated to the Housing Commission could be used by the person used in conjunction with planning.

The Secretary advised that two members of the staff are working on housing sites.

Mr. Fink stated that he would like to be informed monthly of the progress.

The Secretary reported that architects were interviewed today by the housing commission.

Central City Plan. The Board were asked for their recommendations and comments.

Mr. Houston asked the Chairman to check further with the chairman of the Traffic Board for comments.

Mr. Black recommended that the Board read the study and make comments in the margins before returning the booklets to the staff, with a deadline set for Tuesday, February 1st.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:45 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

T/C

attached and marked "Exhibit A" is hereby approved and accepted both as to form and substance and the President or Vice-President of the Lansing Housing Commission is hereby authorized and directed to execute said Contract in quadruplicate on behalf of the Local Authority, and the City Clerk is hereby requested to impress and attest the official seal of the Local Authority on each such counterpart and to forward said executed counterparts, or any of them to the PHA together with such other documents evidencing the approval and authorizing the execution thereof as may be required by the PHA.

Section 2

The General Depositary Agreement in substantially the form of PHA-1999 hereto attached and marked "Exhibit B" is hereby approved and accepted both as to form and substance and the President or Vice-President of the Lansing Housing Commission is hereby authorized and directed to execute said Agreement in quintuplicate on behalf of the Local Authority, and the City Clerk is hereby requested to impress and attest the official seal of the Local Authority to each such counterpart, and to forward three executed counterparts thereof to the PHA, together with such other documents evidencing the approval and authorizing the execution thereof as may be required by the PHA.

Section 3

The President or Vice-President or the Director-Secretary of the Lansing Housing Commission is hereby authorized to file with the PHA from time to time as monies are required, requisitions together with the necessary supporting documents requesting advances to be made on account of the loan provided in the Preliminary Loan Contract. Cash proceeds from the sale of all Preliminary Notes shall be deposited and disbursed only in accordance with the provisions of the Preliminary Loan Contract.

Section 4

This Resolution shall take effect immediately.

It was moved by Commissioner Clapp, supported by Commissioner Owen that the foregoing resolution be adopted.

Motion carried by the following votes:

Yeas: Commissioners Clapp, Oliver, Owen, Patterson—4.

Nays: None.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:30 P.M.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, January 4, 1966

Meeting called to order at 7:31 P.M. by Chairman Russell H. Fink.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Absent None.

HEARINGS

Z-213-65

Mr. Peter J. Treleven, Attorney, representing Mr. George Charlie, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 1616 Linval Street from Residential

"C" two family to "F" commercial district. Mr. Treleven stated that Mr. Charlie has lived at this address since 1939. At that time he was engaged as an auto mechanic and was not working full time at this address. He took in cars at night and did light repair work. His requests for business got so great that he has been doing this for the past 11 years. His property is in the midst of C-2. There are a number of non-conforming uses in the area. He had a small fire in 1949 and filed for a building permit and at this time enclosed a small shed outside the garage. This was an enlargement of his non-conforming use. Mr. Treleven further stated that he did not think this area would upgrade much. This is not the type of neighborhood that this type of operation would cause any noise at night. There is no banging, fumes or drilling, and it is felt that the only thing

that might cause concern would be the cars. He has parking for six cars in the driveway, but has relatives living down the street that could handle any extra cars that might be in need of parking. They would need light industrial to conform with the Code.

Mr. Treleven introduced some of the neighbors that were in the audience in favor of this rezoning.

Mr. Dow of 1700 Linvall, stated that he lives on the corner within about 125 to 130 feet and wouldn't know he was there if he didn't drop in once in a while.

Mr. Herbert Horton of 1620 Linvall stated that he lives next door to him on the South and wouldn't know he was there if he didn't see him. The noise is no bother to him. He has lived here for 18 years, and has not been bothered.

Mr. William Larabee, 1625 Linvall stated that he lives across the street. He has never heard any noise, and Mr. Charlie never bothers anyone.

Mr. George Charlie, the petitioner then spoke and said he doesn't make any unnecessary noise. He leaves about 5 or 6 in the evening. He would like to ask the board to rezone so he can make a livelihood. He works alone, and has lived here for 24 years.

Mr. Reynolds asked why he had filed now, and Mr. Charlie informed him that there had been a complaint from a neighbor filed with the Building Inspector.

Mr. Don Boone of 2501 Devonshire stated that Mr. Charlie had been working on his cars since 1941, and gave a personal recommendation of Mr. Charlie. He further remarked that there was nothing in Mr. Charlie's yard that was objectionable.

The matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-217-65

Mr. Donald Pung, one of the three partners of the Leon Pung Plastering firm appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone a parcel in the 900 Blk., Holten St. described as:

Lot 49 and the north 20 feet of Lot 50, Oakdale Add.

from "B" one family to "C" two family residence district, and presented a copy of their plans to the board. He stated that Holten St. is open at both ends. Some maps show it closed.

Mr. Reynolds asked the width of the building and was told it will be 40 ft. x 40 ft.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-218-65

Mr. Taylor of the American Bank and Trust Company appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 520 Lincoln St. from "B" one family to "J" parking district and stated they were interested in getting his property rezoned, to create more parking for customers and also to shorten the route for customers to get into their facility. Their customers cannot turn left from Cedar on to Greenlawn. They have purchased three lots on Greenlawn and had the zoning changed, these being Lots 96, 99, and 100. Twenty feet of Lot 100 has been dedicated for an alley.

Mr. Black asked if the people can come through the alley and was advised that the alley is a busy place. They have three drive-in windows and the alley to the south is owned by the drive-in.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-219-65

Mr. Donald Hines, attorney, representing General Motors Corp. appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at Olds, William, Division and Butler (entire block) described as:

Property located in the City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan described as:

Block 2, Morrison's Subdivision of Block 16 of Townsend's Subdivision of the North $\frac{1}{2}$ of Section 20, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan except the North $\frac{1}{2}$ of Lot 1 and the South 66 feet of Lot 17 and 18, and the South 90 feet of the East 21 $\frac{1}{3}$ feet, of Lot 16, Block 2, said Morrison's Subdivision, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan.

The North $\frac{1}{2}$ of Lot 1, Block 2, Morrison's Subdivision of Block 16 of Townsend's Subdivision on the North $\frac{1}{2}$ of Section 20, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan,

from "J" parking to "I" heavy industrial district and advised that there should be a correction of the diagram inasmuch as the commercial is to be zoned to "I" heavy industrial, too. Basically the entire block with the exception of the south is to be rezoned. He showed the Board a diagram of the layout. They have an option for the property on the Northeast corner and next July General Motors will own this property, too. This is included as industrial in the Master Plan.

Mrs. Bretz asked the number of businesses on the corner and was advised there are three, a cafe, a cafe-bar and one is vacant. Mrs. Bretz then asked if they were all owned by one party, and Mr. Hines advised that perhaps there are several owners.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-223-65

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 924 River-view Street from "B" one family to "G" business district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-223-65

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 4000 Blk. S. Pennsylvania Ave. described as:

541 and 542 Maple Hill Subd., City of Lansing

from "A" one family to "J" parking district.

Matter was referred to the zoning Committee.

Z-224-65

Mr. Reinhart Hasselbring appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 200 Block of North Clippert St. fronting on West side of street described as:

Lots 47, 48, 49, 50, and 51 of Alamo Heights Subd., City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one Residential to "F" commercial district and stated that he operates his business on Grand Avenue, and must relocate because of Urban Renewal. It is their intention to construct a new building using 1000 feet for themselves and the rest for general offices. He presented a drawing to the board.

Mr. Fink asked if they proposed parking in the back, and was advised that it would be on the North.

Mr. Siebert asked if this is the only establishment on the property and was advised in the affirmative.

Mrs. Bretz asked if the building would be for rental and was informed that the bulk will be for rent.

Mr. Fink asked the height of the building, and was told that it would be two stories with 24,000 sq. ft. including basement. There is 8,000 sq. ft. of lot area.

Mr. Siebert asked why they needed the additional property and Mr. Hasselbring replied that this would eliminate a problem with large trucks and long trailers.

Mr. Manz asked if the parking area were zoned "J" and the building "F", would meet his requirements and Mr. Hasselbring stated that it would.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-225-65

Mr. Charles R. Green appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 2400-2500 block of Wabash Road described as:

Outlot B—Manley Subdivision, a part of the E. $\frac{1}{2}$ of the S.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ Section 26, T4N, R2W, Lansing Township, now City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one residential (one family) to "C" two residential (two family) and told of the development of the subdivision, when this was set as an outlot and held for a future date. They plan to continue the development in an orderly manner. They will be happy to dedicate the roadway if necessary. They feel two family will blend with the area. The low area will need correction. The roadway would present egress and ingress to the park development.

Mr. Siebert asked if access would be to the South and Mr. Green stated that Manley would be cut almost in two. This area was used for borrow. Access will be from Aurelius and Stoneleigh Drive, and Wabash, extended to the East.

Mr. Black asked if the board were to be advised of some kind of proposed plan before taking action, such as how is this to be split, and how it is to be developed. Mr. Green said he didn't know. He had planned for ranch and duplexes in orderly fashion. They will have to study the drainage and sewer and will work with the Planning Staff.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-226-65

Mr. John Bean appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 815 W. Lenawee Street from "C" two family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district and told of the area use, and that it is run down now and anything done to it would be an improvement. He would like 10 to 12 unit apartment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-228-65

Mr. Bernard Blackburn appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property

at 5207 S. Cedar Street from "A" one family to "F" commercial district and stated that this is an old theater that has been there for about 20 years. They are in the process of bringing it up-to-date, so that it can be run all winter. The zoning requests was filed because of the change during annexation. They need new rest room facilities and a refreshment stand. There will be no change in operation or use, as it will remain the same as it has in the past 20 years.

Mr. Reynolds asked if a vacated street existed to the North. Mr. Blackburn advised that it is not used. There were two houses, both are now demolished so that there is no need for the street. It is more like an alley.

Mr. Siebert asked if the whole area would be used for the theater. Mr. Blackburn stated that it might go back to the ramp and as wide as they can go. There is a narrow entrance. They have signed a new lease and the owner wants to hold the frontage for other business. They put up a new fence last year. They have invested \$40,000 in car heaters. A new building would be a better tax base.

Mr. Siebert asked if there would be access to Jolly and was told there would not be.

The Secretary asked if they had leased the property to the North, and was informed it was. Both pieces of property have the same owner.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-229-65

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 2000 Blk. Wood Street described as:

Lot Number 1, Bancroft Hills, a Subdivision on part of the S.W. $\frac{1}{2}$ of Section 2, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one family to "C" two family district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

c. Communication: Writer or representative in audience to give additional information.

Z-185-65

8:42 P.M. Mr. Tony Nosal appeared and stated his name and gave the number of his zoning petition which he had petitioned for rezoning in September. "I be-

lieve I did inform the board by letter communication on the way I felt, but due to the recent attorney's opinion that the staff study, staff analysis, is for public record, to the late date that I did get it, today, in all fairness to your fine body, your fine board, and myself, I should make these comments. I want to thank you for the opportunity to once again have a few words with the board. I would like to call to your attention a few important items to the planning staff's analysis and its recommendation that the Planning Board recommend to the City Council that my petition be denied. We will skip item 1, 2, and 3, because if I can put my point across on 4, 5, and 6, there won't be no object of 1, 2, or 3.

Number 4 of the Planning Staff's study and analysis potential residential area should be protected against encroachment of commercial use and vice versa. Well, ladies and gentlemen, and members of the board, as for the vice versa, how is the recommended residential as to this property in question being protected as to the properties adjacent to the east and south.

Number 5. The staff study and analysis says the existing commercial facilities adjacent and to the east both size and location-wise fit quite well into the development of this area. Now I don't know what 'quite well' means and as far as this No. 5, how far east are we going—all the way to Logan Center or including Logan Center? Are we going West as far as Waverly and Holmes Rd. where recently there was a zoning of 8 acres for a new shopping center?

No. 6. Enlargement of the commercial facilities (they are talking about mine and I will call your attention that mine is 2 and $\frac{3}{4}$ acres, I'm asking in the neighborhood of 4 acres) would be contrary to shopping center standards and detract from the over-all plan. Well I got this question. What plan and whose over-all plan? As far as the standard central shopping center standards, well let me read you a little article from the *State Journal*, as far as the standards. I believe at your last meeting, a special meeting, I would like to read this to you, this is from the *State Journal* of the 22nd of December this year, last year.

"Neller clashed with the Board when the Zoning Committee wanted to limit the development of 9 acres to a neighborhood shopping center until 1972, and then allow the development for 15 more acres as a regional.

Well, gentlemen as far as the standards in this analysis study, I too would be under 8 acres as a shopping center, also classified as a neighborhood shopping center. The only difference in my case is I have the residential growth there already. Gentlemen, I believe, and I sincerely believe that I am only asking for something that is for the betterment of the community, and the betterment of Lansing,

and I sincerely believe and I want to thank you for your consideration and I am hopefully looking forward to your favorable decision. Thank you."

The Secretary then remarked, that Mr. Nosal brought up three or four questions one of them was whose plan and what plan. In his discussion of the staff analysis he omitted 1, 2, and 3. Question No. 1 of the staff analysis states the Master Land Use Plan. Obviously No. 5 which he is referring to fits well into the area, refers back to the overall plan of the City of Lansing. On page 209, of the Lansing Master Plan there are standards set forth in terms of the size and area of shopping facilities and as to the amount of population to be served by them, the distance, etc. This is in terms of neighborhood facilities, community facilities and regional facilities and your center, Mr. Nosal, falls under the classification of a neighborhood facility. As such the standards are referred to in the staff analysis would be in the Master Plan and are embodied on page 209.

Mr. Nosal then stated, "that he thought Mr. Guernsey was right, but let's be a little consistent. Let's go west and let's look at the Master Plan at the corner of Waverly Road and Holmes Road where there is an 8-10 acre shopping center zoned for "J" parking and "F" commercial. That area isn't even developed and I believe that will show being annexed according to the Master Plan, it may be on your upgrading Master Plan, but on your old master plan, and your land usage map that will be with your new zoning ordinance, that is classified also as residential at this point. I believe this, I sincerely believe it, we're going to have a new zoning ordinance. We are going to have to upgrade this and this land usage, and therefore, I believe the book may say that my corner calls for only three acre shopping center, but it isn't very logical to zone a mile from there 8 acres for shopping center, when your land map usage or Comprehensive Master Plan at this point is residential."

Mr. Fink advised Mr. Nosal that the Board did recommend to City Council on the parcel he was referring to that the shopping center of 4 acres or less. The City Council saw fit to change our recommendation, so any comment you might have in regard to that should be taken up with them.

Mr. Nosal then stated he wished to call their attention to another rezoning and he believed the Board did recommend this one, and this one was 6.2 acres for a fine gentleman by the name of Mr. Fine and it happens to be in the private area which wasn't developed and I think the Planning Board recommended the 6.2 acres in that case and that is on Waverly Rd. just north of Jolly Rd. and the Master Plan again there did not call for a commercial. If we are going to upgrade the Master Plan and the new zoning ordinance, we are natur-

ally going to have to have a Land Use map, and we are going to have to upgrade that and, but gentlemen, here in my instance where the area is demanding more stores and I am committed, I have three tenants and I am building two buildings now, and as I noticed on our new Master Land Use Plan that you have started you have only the small shopping centers on it. I think it is time we upgrade it. Here is the time to make the move. This is a built-up area. Thank you."

Recess from 8:52 to 9:41 P.M.

Z-148-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the request to withdraw the petition by Walter Neller Enterprises, Inc. to rezone a parcel at the N.W. corner of S. Washington and Edgewood Road described as:

E. 5 acres of the S. 8 acres of that part of the S.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of N.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ lying W. of South Washington Road Section 8, T3N, R2W,

be granted.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-185-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Anthony Nosal to rezone property at 2233 and 2323 W. Holmes Road from "A" one family to "F" commercial district be denied.

Platting should precede any zoning or further structural development of the land. Plans for platting in this area for residential use have been established which include the necessary stub streets for proper access.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as residential.

Motion by Manz, seconded by Houston that the original motion include that the north 200 ft. be rezoned. There followed some discussion concerning this amendment and the extension of Richmond and Calvin Streets.

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Black that the matter be tabled for 30 days for more recommendations from the staff.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-195-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that

the petition by Kayle G. Doty to rezone a parcel at 2901 S. Cedar Street described as:

Lot 232 and Lot 233 of the South Parkwood Subdivision

from "E-1" district to "E-2" district be denied, and that the

East 10 ft. of the above described property

be rezoned from "E-1" drive-in to "J" parking and the

Balance of the property

be rezoned from "E-1" drive-in to "E-2" drive in shop district with screening to be provided along the East property line, except for a 25 ft. setback on Denver Street.

Screening to consist of one of the following:

1. A 5 ft. high cyclone type fence with interwoven slats.
2. A 3 ft. high cyclone type fence with dense evergreen plantings of a mature height of 5 ft. to 5 ft. 6 in. in height.
3. A 5 ft. high redwood or cedar louvered fence with boards running perpendicular to the ground.

This site falls within the area designated as general commercial on the Master Land Use Plan.

This use was conforming prior to May, 1960, and became non-conforming when service stations were deleted from the "E-1" district and adopted into the "E-2" district.

Due to the existing development in the area, and the established use on the site, the Board believes that it would be unreasonable to deny the request.

Z-201-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Peter Bilbija to rezone a parcel at the N.W. corner Hazel and Raider described as:

Lot No. 48 of Raider's Subdivision

from "C" two family district to "J" parking district be granted.

The Board believes that this rezoning will provide a proper transition between the industrial use to the south and the residential uses to the north.

Screening of one of the following types to be provided along the north property line, except for the residential setback on Raider Street.

1. A 5 ft. high cyclone type fence with interwoven slats.
2. A 3 ft. high cyclone type fence with dense evergreen plantings of a mature height of 5 ft. to 5 ft. 6 in. in height.
3. A 5 ft. high redwood or cedar louvered fence with boards running perpendicular to the ground.

Low evergreen plantings be provided along the setback.

Further, the parking area be lighted with a minimum of 2/10 lumens light per sq. ft. directed on the parking area, so as not to affect adjacent properties or passing motorists.

A parking lot development would allow reasonable use of the land and with proper reasoning and lighting would have very little affect on the adjacent properties.

The rezoning would encourage use of the land with the necessary and required improvements.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-202-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by W. R. Grace & Co., Davison Chemical Division to rezone a parcel at 2405 Rheamont Avenue from "B" one family district to "J" parking district be granted.

Screening of one of the following to be provided along the south property line.

1. A 5 ft. high cyclone type fence with interwoven slats.
2. A 3 ft. high cyclone type fence with 5 ft. high dense evergreen plantings.
3. A 5 ft. high redwood or cedar louvered fence with boards running perpendicular to the ground.

Lighting of 2/10 lumens per sq. ft. directed on the parking area so as not to affect adjacent properties.

Access to the site should be from the west, which would discourage traffic on Rheamont Avenue, a residential street.

The master land use plan indicates this area as future industrial expansion.

The "J" parking zone will provide a transition between the existing residential to the south and the industrial to the North.

The Board further recommends that the "J" parking requirements as requested for the zoning petition passed by Council on August 1, 1949 for property in the 2300 block of N. High Street, be enforced on the area west of this site which was zoned "J" Parking.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-203-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Buddy Campbell to rezone a parcel at 5614 Schafer Street from "A-1" Residential to "C-2" Family district be denied, as it is not in harmony with surrounding zoning or land use.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area (as low density residential (2-3) dwelling units per net acre).

The development in this area is entirely single family on large lots or parcels of land.

The granting of this request would lead to additional requests for rezoning, to a higher density in this area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-204-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Les Seidell to rezone a parcel at 405 E. Holmes Road from "A-1" family district to "D-M" Multiple district be granted.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this site as medium density residential (4-10 dwelling units per acre.)

The location of the parcel in relation to the existing land uses, makes apartment zoning more desirable, than single family zoning.

The site meets most of the criteria for apartment zoning.

This rezoning would be another step toward providing a transition between the strip commercial development fronting on S. Cedar Street and the residential development to the west.

The drain easement will provide additional open space and off-street parking.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-205-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the petition by R. L. Lyons of the Walter Neller Company to rezone a parcel at 738-740 N. Pennsylvania Avenue from "C" Two Family District to "D-M" Multiple District be tabled for thirty days for additional information.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-207-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that that the petition by George and Theodore Grabowski to rezone a parcel at 1434 E. Jolly Road from "A" one family district to "H" Light Industrial district be granted as this is considered a reasonable extension of the existing use.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-208-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that petition be held for submission of a plot plan.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-209-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Edward W. Sparrow Hospital Association as amended to rezone a parcel at 1110 A & B Jerome and East to Main hospital building; also Northwest corner Jerome and Holmes Street described as:

All of Lot 1 and the South 120 feet of Lot 3, Amended Plat of Downer's Sunnyside Addition from "D-M" Multiple Dwelling to "J" Parking;

Lot 10, excepting the East 27.75 feet, Block 1, of Ingersoll's Addition, from "D-M" Multiple Dwelling to "J" Parking and

Lot 4, Block C, of Gower's Addition, from "C-2" Family to "J" Parking, from "D-M" Multiple Dwelling district to "J" parking district be granted.

Screening of one of the following is to be provided along the north line of Lot 4 Block C of Gower's Addition (except for the residential setback on Holmes Street) and along that portion of the west line of Lot 3, Amended Plat of Downer's Sunnyside Addition:

1. A 5 foot high cyclone type fence with interwoven slats,
2. A 3 foot high cyclone type fence with dense evergreen plantings of a mature height of 5 ft. to 5 ft. 6 in. in height.
3. A 5 ft. high redwood or cedar louvered fence with boards running perpendicular to the ground.
4. With low evergreen plantings to be provided along the North line of Lot 4 within the residential setback line.

Lighting to be provided on the parking area of not less than 2/10 lumens per sq. ft. so directed as not to affect adjacent properties or passing motorists.

The Board further recommends that low evergreen plantings be provided along East Line of Lots 1, 3, and 4 Amended Plat of Downer's Sunnyside Addition.

The Board believes that with proper screening, lighting and off-street parking lot improvements, this use will not be detrimental to the area, and will help to relieve some of the on-street parking congestion that now exists throughout the area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-210-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by the Planning Board to rezone a parcel at 2800 block N. Grand River Avenue describes as:

Lots 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, Supervisor's Plat of Cynwood Heights

from "A" one family residence district to "E" apartment shop district be granted, and further recommends that

Lots 26 and 27 Supervisor's Plat of Cynwood Heights.

be rezoned from "A" one family to "J" parking district with the necessary screening.

Screening to be provided along the North property line of Lot 26 except for a 25 ft. set-back on Cynwood Avenue and to consist of one of the following:

1. A 5 ft. high cyclone type fence with interwoven slats.
2. A 3 ft. high cyclone fence with dense evergreen plantings of a mature height of 5 ft. to 5 ft. 6 in. in height.
3. A 5 ft. high redwood or cedar louvered fence with boards running perpendicular to the ground.

Low evergreen plantings to be provided along the residential set-back line on Cynwood Avenue.

Lighting to be provided on the parking area of not less than 2/10 lumens per sq. ft. so directed so as not to affect adjacent properties or passing motorists.

Upon annexation, this property was zoned "A" one family. Due to the three existing commercial uses between Cynwood Avenue and Mildred Street, this recommendation would properly establish the zoning.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-211-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Harold R. Bodine, representing B. & H. Enterprises, Inc. to rezone a parcel in the 1000 block Dennis Street described as:

Lot 59, Plat of Bettenfield Subdivision No. 2

from "A" one family residence to "C" two family residence district be denied.

The existing development of the surrounding property is single family.

Change of zoning would be a trend toward changing the character of the residential area.

The change would adversely affect living conditions in the immediate area principally through an increase in traffic and activity.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be used under the existing zoning.

Mr. Manz asked if the property to the east is owned by the same person and was advised that it was. He then stated he would be in favor of this being zoned "C" two family.

Mr. Black stated that he agreed with Mr. Manz.

Motion failed by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Reynolds, Heino, Siebert—5.

Nays: Black, Houston, Manz—3.

Motion by Houston, seconded by Reynolds that the matter be reconsidered.

Motion carried.

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Houston, that the matter be tabled for 30 days, and the Board request a plot plan.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Houston, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: Heino—1.

Z-212-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Ellene M. Frank to rezone a parcel in the 700 and 800 blocks of E. Jolly Road described as:

W. 42.63 A of N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ exc. S. 80 R. also exc. com. 721.9 ft. E. of N.W. cor. Sec. 3, th. E. 66 ft. S. 330 ft. W. 66 ft. N. to beg.; Sec. 3, T3N, R2W,

from "A" one family district to "G-2" wholesale or to "H" light industrial district be denied and the petitioner be encouraged to plat under the existing zoning.

Most of the adjacent property is developed with, and zoned for residential uses.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates the surrounding area as low density residential (2-3 dwelling units per net acre.)

This change would adversely affect living conditions in this area through an increase of traffic and activity.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Manz, Reynolds, and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-214-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by William and Dorothy

McCurdy to rezone a parcel at 3831 Moores River Drive from "A-1" district to "C-2" and "D-M" Multiple district be denied.

1. The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as low density residential (2-3 dwelling units per net acre).
2. The predominate land use in this section of Waverly Road and Moores River Drive is single family residences on above average size lots. The proposed zoning would permit only one principle structure to be erected on the 123 ft. x 511 ft. lot. This structure could contain more than 45 units, and as such would be out of character with the existing developed neighborhood.
3. The granting of the "D-M" multiple request would allow a high density development at the critical intersection of Moores River Drive and Waverly Road, creating additional traffic conflict at this point.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Block, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Manz, Reynolds, and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-214-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by William and Dorothy McCurdy to rezone a parcel at 3500-3800 Cooley Drive described as:

"Lots 2 and 4 of McCurdy Acres and Lots 17 and 27 of McCurdy Acres No. 2"

from "A-1" district to "C-2" and "D-M" Multiple district be denied.

1. The requests are contrary to the established Land Use Pattern and the Master Land Use Plan.
2. The change will adversely affect living conditions in the area principally through an increase of traffic.
3. The change would alter the population density pattern and thereby increase the load on public facilities (schools, sewers, and streets).

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Manz, Reynolds, and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-215-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Rev. Andrew Gill to rezone

a parcel at 1830 W. St. Joseph Street from "B-1" Family district to "C" apartment shop district, be denied.

This area is zoned for and developed with single family residences.

The size of the lot, 5,420 sq. ft., is inadequate for two businesses, three apartments and the required off-street parking.

Residential areas should be protected against the encroachment of spot commercial uses which are not in harmony with the existing neighborhood.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Manz, Reynolds, and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-109-64

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the matter be removed from the table.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: Manz—1

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition to rezone the property at the Northeast corner of Logan and Holmes Road described as:

That part of S.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of S.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 29, lying W. of Washington Ave., exc. com. at int'n E'y line S. Logan St. and E. and W. $\frac{1}{2}$ line of S.E. $\frac{1}{4}$, th. E. 936.2 ft., S. 245 ft., W. 515 ft., S. 5 ft., W. to E. line S. Logan St., N. to beg.; Sec. 29, T4N, R2W.

Commencing at int'n. W. line Sec. 28 and S. line Logancrest Subd., th. E. along S. line Logancrest Subd. to W'y line S. Washington Ave., SW'y along said W'y line S. Washington Ave. to W. line Section 28, N. to beg.; Sec. 28, T4N, R2W.

from "F" commercial and "J" parking district to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be granted.

Shopping facilities now in existence provide more area than required to serve the available market and Master Plan standards.

There exists, and is available, commercially zoned land for future expansion.

Residential development should be encouraged to counterbalance the abundance of commercial zoning in this area and throughout the city.

This property was originally zoned to accommodate a shopping center. A shopping center has developed on the industrial land west of Logan St. north of Holmes Road.

Lansing's Master Plan indicates that the Central Business District and Frandor provides the regional size centers required by this urban area.

Intensive work and considerable expense is being directed toward revitalizing the core city. Indiscriminate, extensive commercial zoning can detract or possibly negate this objective.

No evidence produced at the hearing, November 10, 1964, would justify community retaining status quo.

Mr. Houston suggested that it might be in the best interest of the board if a copy of the court decision were placed in the file. He further suggested that the records showing the owner of the property following the court decision be placed in the file.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: Houston—1.

STREETS COMMITTEE

S-26-65

Motion by Houston, seconded by Manz that the Board recommend to City Council that the Final Plat of Rivers Edge No. 1 be approved by City Council subject to the following conditions:

All public improvements shall be installed with complete public utilities including water, sanitary sewers, storm sewers and full street improvements including street paving, curb and gutter, sidewalks and such other improvements as required under Section VI D of Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

Easements for the construction and perpetual maintenance of conduits, poles, wires and fixtures for electric lights, telephones and other public and quasi-public utilities shall be provided as required by the Board of Water and Light.

The posting of financial security, as outlined in Section VI B Lansing Subdivision Regulations in the amount of:

Storm and Sanitary Sewers...\$121,349.

Street Grade and Gravel ... 26,500.

\$147,849.

prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

All other standards and requirements of Lansing Subdivision Regulations and the Michigan State Plat Act, Act 172, Public Act of 1929, as amended, shall apply.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

S-28-65

Motion by Houston, seconded by Manz that the Board recommend to City Council that the final plat of Somerset No. 3 be disapproved without prejudice in accordance with the following sections of the City of Lansing Subdivision Regulations:

Section V A 1 The proposed subdivision and its ultimate use shall be in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan as adopted and shall not encroach upon any area designated in the Comprehensive Plan for future public use.

Section V B 1 The arrangement, character, extent, width, grade and location of all streets shall conform to the Major Street plan as adopted by the Planning Board and shall be considered in their relation to existing and planned streets, to topographic conditions, to public convenience and safety, and in their appropriate relation to the proposed user of the land to be served by such streets.

Specifically, the plat does not relate itself to the future public use of U.S. 127. The plat does not provide continuity or/and appropriate relation to the proposed highway, and existing and proposed uses adjacent to and within the plat.

The plat will be given further consideration when it has been redesigned to comply with the relocation route of U.S. 127.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Mr. Houston read the letter from William Crow on the Market Study. Mr. Houston asked that the director provide the Streets Committee with a map of the bridge to cross Ottawa as mentioned in the CIP program.

URBAN RENEWAL

Poxson Property Acquisition Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Houston that the Board recommend to City Council that

acting upon the Council's Buildings and properties committee's proposal that the Poxson property at 206-208 E. Michigan be acquired the Planning Board at their January 4, 1966 meeting considered the following points and made their recommendation. Acquisition of the Poxson property would fulfill the following goals:

1. To help fulfill the goals of the River Improvement Committee for river beautification.
2. To provide a park setting similar to the park proposed for the area north of Michigan Ave. between Grand Ave. and the river. The addition of the Poxson property would help balance the architectural design of the approach to the Mall and the State Capitol Building.
3. To provide a possible access to the east in lieu of Allegan Street if a decision is ever made to build an additional bridge across the river from Allegan Street.
4. It is expected that the Michigan Avenue bridge will have to be replaced in the near future. Acquisition of the Poxson property would allow for the redesigning of the bridge approach if this is deemed necessary.

The property has previously been offered to the City for approximately \$250,000. The present offer is about \$200,000. At the present time the City has not had the opportunity to have the property appraised. The building is a sound structure. Thus it may be a problem to get federal approval for inclusion in Urban Renewal Project No. 1. If the city recommends the property be acquired and an amendment to the Project No. 1 be made, it will be six to nine months before acquisition of the property could be made complete. An amendment to Project No. 1 would mean changes in the financial section, the project boundary, and the plan itself. This, of course, would require a public hearing.

If the property were acquired through a third renewal project the time lapse till the property could be acquired would be over a year—if the application was approved.

Acquisition of the property for all the aforementioned purposes is rightly recognized. Proceeding upon the basis that there is a need to acquire the property, it then follows that the city should try to get federal approval for a project No. 1 amended to include the Poxson property in project No. 1. In the event that an amendment is denied by the Urban Renewal Administration, it is recommended that consideration be given to the initiation of an Urban Renewal Project No. 3 which would include the Poxson property. Although the action might take a long time to carry through to acquisition, it would still provide the city with the park facility and the possibility of providing access for a new street to the east.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Motion by Houston, seconded by Black that the Traffic Department be contacted for a traffic analysis of the core study also a bridge concept of Ottawa at Allegan or Allegan and Washtenaw.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-188-65

Motion by Houston, seconded by Heino that the petition by Walter Neller Ent. and Neller Homes to rezone the property at 6326 S. Cedar Street from "A" One Family to Community Unit Plan remain on the table for 30 days.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-138-65

Motion by Houston, seconded by Reynolds that the petition by Bruce Hartwick to rezone a parcel at 2431 N. Grand River Avenue from "A" One Family and "J" parking to "F" Commercial and "D-M" Multiple dwelling district revised to Community Unit Plan on November 18, 1965 be removed from the table for a staff recommendation at the next regular meeting, February 1, 1966.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

PLANNING DIRECTORS REPORT

The Secretary called the Board's attention to the Staff Progress Report and the number of items now under consideration and the number of telephone calls and appointments handled during the month.

Mention was made of the preparation of the Capital Improvements Program this year with the help of the Mayor's Capital Improvements Committee.

The Board's attention was called to the Mayor's Annual Message that was published in the State Journal.

On personnel, the Secretary advised that Miss Christine M. Harrison had transferred to the Redevelopment office and was replaced by Marva Pullins.

The third draftsman, Claus W. Boeckmann was to start work on February 10th.

Mr. Robert L. Rizzuti of Denver, Colorado had been hired as a Planner VIII, and was to start work on February 7th.

OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

Motion by Houston, seconded by Black that a copy of the letter from the City Attorney relative to the releasing of materials in the staff report should be forwarded to each board member, and that the Rules of Procedure should be changed with the director to draft the change, and have ready for action at the next regular scheduled meeting.

It was further requested that a clarification be obtained from the City Attorney.

On the letter from Manson, Jackson and Kane, Inc. a copy of this is to be mailed to members of the Zoning Committee.

Copies of the letter from Mr. Howard DeWolfe are to be mailed to the Zoning Committee.

Mr. Houston then asked where the Board's recommendation stood in regard to increasing the zoning filing fees, and was advised that Council was delaying any action until the new zoning ordinance and map were developed.

Copies of the memo from the City Assessor in regard to Assessors Plats were to be sent to the Streets Committee.

NEW BUSINESS

The report on coordination with Regional Planning Commission was read. Motion by Black, seconded by Manz that the recommendation of the Board be forwarded to Tri County.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Secretary advised that he had been asked to work on the Tract Censusing Areas.

The Secretary was asked to contact Tri-County for a date on a transportation presentation.

Z-118-65

The letter from John Cote in regard to the rezoning petition for property in the 1500 Block of Waverly filed by Louis and George Eyde was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Mr. Houston requested that a letter be sent to Mr. A. J. Husband on Lenawee Street regarding the zoning process.

Meeting adjourned at 11:55 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

M/C

Mr. Saenz, 4822 Richmond

Ted Davenport, 608 West St.

Father Faiver and Mr. Canady from Cristo
Rey Church

Mr. Wells, Relocation officer of Michigan
State Highway Dept.

Louis F. Adado presented resolution.

By Councilman Dean—

Resolved by the City Council of the City
of Lansing:

F/B

That the attached claims be allowed and
the City Clerk be and she is hereby author-
ized to draw orders on the City Treasurer
for the amount allowed each claimant, in
the amount of \$58,849.86.

Adopted by the following vote:

Unanimously.

Council adjourned at 10:50 P.M.

THEO FULTON,
City Clerk.

Lansing, Michigan

March 14, 1966

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Special Meeting, January 18, 1966

Meeting was called to order by Chairman
Russell H. Fink.

Notices of this meeting had been sent
to the News media.

Present were. Black, Fink, Houston, Rey-
nolds and Manz—5.

Absent Bretz, Heino and Siebert—3.

Motion by Houston, seconded by Reynolds
that the rules of procedure be suspended
so that the Board might take official action.

Motion by Houston, seconded by Reynolds
that the following resolution be forwarded
to City Council.

That the Planning Board go on record
supporting the City Council for its ap-
proach on the parking problems of the
downtown area.

That the Lansing City Council be com-
mended for its determination and action
to implement a long range program for
adequate parking facilities in the Central
Business District.

The Board recommends that the Council
maintain its program of providing tem-
porary parking in the Urban Renewal as
well as other areas and suggest that should
the parking ramps not be completed on
schedule, that shuttle bus service to
adjacent parking areas be provided through
the Christmas season.

Mr. Black asked what about this shuttle
bus service—from where to where?

Mr. Reynolds stated that it would be
some outlying area. This would go a long
way in relieving the parking problems.

Mr. Fink stated that this could well be
an area around the market or south of the
market. There are many areas in this
vicinity that are fairly close to downtown
where this could be accomplished.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Fink, Houston, Manz, Rey-
nolds—5.

Nays: None.

Motion by Houston, seconded by Manz
that the Board recommend to the City
Council the approval of the Capitol Avenue
Ramp, located in

Block 127, Original Plat of the City of Lansing with the exception of Lots 1, 2, 7, 12 and the South 24.75 ft. of the W'y 115.5 ft. of Lot 8.

Mr. Houston stated that there had been some discussion on the ramp exterior.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Fink, Houston, Reynolds and Manz—5.

Nays: None.

Motion by Houston seconded by Reynolds that the Grand Avenue ramp located in:

Block 112, Original Plat of the City of Lansing Lots 1, 2, 3 and 4

be approved subject to the following:

Traffic flow for the ramp in the adjacent area should provide for direct exit to Washtenaw and other street patterns that might be developed.

1. The traffic flow for the ramp and adjacent area should;

- a. Provide for direct exit to Washtenaw for access to the west and southwest of the city.
- b. Additional traffic lanes on Grand Ave. and intersection design at Michigan Ave. should be accomplished in accordance with the plans and timed with the construction of the ramp.

- c. A program for future street widenings and other traffic flow improvements in the area should be initiated and their implementation programmed.

2. Intrusion into the river for placement of ramp supports is not believed a good example for the City to set for private developers and thus, should be avoided.
3. Incorporate pedestrian walkway along the river side of the ramp, and further beautification of the river banks should be carried out as soon as possible.
4. Landscaping of the project should be coordinated with the Parks Department so the scheduling of plant material and plant containers can be installed as part of the total project development.
5. That ramp exits should be developed in an esthetic and functional manner.
6. Further consideration should be given to a pedestrian overpass over Grand Avenue to the ramp.

Alan Hayes, Traffic Engineer, discussed the parking ramps, and the traffic flow around them.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Fink, Houston, Manz and Reynolds—4.

Nays: Black—1.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLUMBING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, February 10, 1966

Meeting was called to order by Chairman, George Wyllie at 7:30 p.m.

Members present: Wm. Miles, George Wyllie, Ralph Gunthrope, Larry Kain, John Brady, Geo Denfield, G. J. Turney.

Inspector Arnold Dell.

Minutes of the last meeting were approved as read.

Old business: Amendments to the plumbing code which was submitted to the Ordinance Committee and the City Attorney in 1965 was discussed. Mr. Wyllie and Mr. Dell was to contact the City Attorney as to the statute of the additions approved by the Board for adoption. The above items will be reported on at the next meeting.

Considerable discussion regarding the use of PC 4 caulking compound cord for sewer pipe joints and connection.

The Board delayed any action until more information was obtained from the plumbers in the area that have used it and given their opinions as to its comparison with hot-lead poured joints.

Meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Next meeting, Thursday, March 10, at 7:30 p.m. at the City Hall.

Respectfully submitted,

G. J. TURNEY,
Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, February 15, 1966

Meeting was called to order at 7:30 P.M. by Chairman Russell N. Fink.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Siebert—5.

Absent: Manz, Houston and Reynolds—3.

BUSINESS SESSION

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Bretz that the minutes of December 21, 1965 be approved.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Siebert—5.

Nays: None.

Discussion followed concerning the printing of minutes and the secretary was requested not to forward the minutes to the City Clerk for publication until they have been approved by the Board.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-199-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the petition to rezone the property in the 1400-1500 Blk. Marquette Street described as:

Commencing northwest corner Lot 168, M. Mitschkun's Oak Grove Subd. No. 2, Thence Southwesterly to southwest corner Lot 168, northwesterly along northerly line Marquette Ave. 250

ft., northeasterly 200 ft. to southerly line C & O RR R/W southeasterly 250 ft. to beginning, Section 5, T4N, R2W

from "A" one family residence to Community Unit Plan called Biltmore Apartments be tabled until the revised site plan has been submitted indicating the 12 unit structure and site design.

Motion carried unanimously.

Z-157-65

Motion by Black, seconded by Bretz that a public hearing on the Amendment to the Community Unit Plan called Heritage Arms by Gordon Long of Warner and Long Development Corporation, located at 3031 S. Washington Avenue, be set for March 8, 1966 at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1, Sixth Floor of City Hall.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Siebert—5.

Nays: None.

Z-138-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert, that the petition by Bruce Hartwig to rezone a parcel at 2431 N. Grand River Avenue from "A" one family and "J" Parking to "F" Commercial and "D-M" Multiple dwelling district revised to Community Unit Plan be tabled. The matter to be removed from the table when a revised site plan has been submitted to the staff, reviewed, analyzed and a recommendation presented to the Board.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, and Siebert—5.

Nays: None.

STREETS COMMITTEE

Discussion was held on right-of-way and pavement width standards throughout the metropolitan area.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee for report on March 15, 1966.

BUILDINGS AND PROPERTIES

BP-4-66

Motion by Black, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that after considering the request of St. Lawrence Hospital to purchase City Parking

Lot No. 14 located at the N.E. corner of Saginaw and Westmoreland, that the parking lot be retained by the city.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino and Siebert—5.

Nays: None.

BP-5-66

Motion by Black, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that they accept the deed to the property described as:

N. 20 acres of E. 60 acres of W. $\frac{1}{2}$ of S.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ except N. 30 ft., Section 33, T4N, R2W

from Walter and Helen Staskowski.

The Planning Board further approves the location, character and extent thereof of this property which is restricted by the donor for use as a park-school site or any other purpose in the general public interest.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino and Siebert—5.

Nays: None.

URBAN RENEWAL

The Board discussed the amendment to the Redevelopment and the refusal of bids plan for the 100 Blk. of N. Washington Ave. The parcel is being advertised for bids.

Mr. Brown gave a resume of the Housing Statement, a copy of which has been given to the board members. The Statement was prepared for the League of Women Voters. Housing policies of the Board were discussed, and a statement to be included in the Board's annual achievement report.

ORDINANCE

Board Members were informed that City Council had confirmed a Public Hearing on the Mobile Park Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance for February 22, 1966 at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1 of City Hall and a Public Hearing for the Yard Definitions Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance on February 22, 1966 at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1 of City Hall.

In regard to the status of the proposed Ordinance, a meeting of the committee was

set for Friday, February 18th at 8:00 A.M. at Holly's Restaurant, to review the Mobile Park Amendment.

Motion by Black, seconded by Bretz, that the City Council be asked to set a public hearing on the proposed amendments to the Code of Ordinances by revising sections 36-25, 36-28, 36-46, and 36-37 requiring greater lot area per dwelling unit and a higher ratio of parking per dwelling unit in both the "D-M" and "D" zoning districts, for Tuesday, March 8, 1966 at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1, Sixth Floor of City Hall.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

The Secretary reported on future meetings with the Chamber of Commerce and the Mayor to discuss the program.

FINANCE

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino that \$800.00 be transferred from the account 170 110 to the 170 301 account to provide funds for printing supplies.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, and Siebert—5.

Nays: None.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Black that the 1966-67 Budget and Work program be approved subject to the corrections as noted on Page 7 and 8 of the report.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The current status of the Community Renewal Program and its staffing was discussed.

Moved by Siebert and seconded by Heino that the meeting adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at 9:25 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF URBAN REDEVELOPMENT BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, February 24, 1966

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 P.M. by Chairman Everett V. Eschbach.

ROLL CALL

Present: Eschbach, Griffin, Hilley, Ramey, Reynolds, Rosa—6.

Absent: Mrs. Hager—1.

It was moved and supported that the minutes of January 18, January 27, and February 8 be approved.

Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Rosa, Chairman of Committee for the Selection of a Mall Design Consultant reported that the Committee was not prepared to make a recommendation yet and

the next meeting of the Committee would be at noon, March 9.

It was moved by Hilley and seconded by Rosa that parcel 5-14 be recommended to the City Council for approval to purchase for the amount of \$19,500. City Council approval is also requested to recommend the purchase of the irremovable fixtures on Parcel 5-14 in an amount not to exceed \$2,400.

Motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Rosa and seconded by Russell that Charles Green be given until March 15 under the present time extension for obtaining any remaining options and then turning the property files back to the Department for processing. This would terminate the services of the acquisition agency for these parcels under the con-

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Special Meeting, February 22, 1966

Meeting was called to order at 7:40 P.M.
by Chairman Russell H. Fink.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Black, Bretz, Fink, Houston, Manz and Reynolds—6

Absent: Heino and Siebert—2.

Also present and introduced to the audience were Councilmen Belen, Bradshaw and Perrin; Mr. Gerald Ernst, City Assessor; and Mr. Gerald Graves, City Treasurer.

HEARINGS

Mr. Fink explained the purpose of the hearing and how the matter will be handled.

Amendment to the Zoning Code-Yard Requirements—The Secretary read the proposed change aloud.

No one appeared in objection to this ordinance change.

Matter was referred to the Ordinance Committee.

Amendment to the Zoning Code-Mobile Home Amendment—The Secretary read the mobile home amendment. Mr. Edwin P. Brown and Mr. Robert L. Rizzuti presented the staff's recommendations on this ordinance.

There were approximately 165 people in the audience.

Slips were distributed to those persons in the audience wishing to make comments or to ask questions about the proposed amendment.

Recess was from 8:08 to 8:25 P.M.

Mr. Daniel A. Dowsett, of 26150 Fenkell, Detroit, Executive Director of the Michigan Mobile Home Association stated that he wanted to commend the board and the City of Lansing for the progress and updating

of the code for housing that has become part of the American life today, and volunteered their help. He stated that he felt it was an excellent ordinance. He introduced Mr. Dick Biedier of the Mobile Homes Association and Mr. Schweit, his assistant. They agreed with Mr. Dowsett that it is good, but did not care to give any specific comments at this time.

Mr. Merie Warner a Lansing area dealer read a note from the Secretary of State, James M. Hare. The note mentioned that since 1968 there has been an increase from 28,000 to 42,000 in the state. These people deserve adequate parking facilities and it was his hope that Lansing would be progressive in this area.

Mr. T. Michael Doyle of 3028 E. LaFayette Circle, an attorney, spoke for about 400 families in the northwest section of Lansing who were opposed to having a mobile home park in this "A" one family area. In particular all of these families have expressed the desire and believe that the Mobile Home development should be as it is stated in the proposed ordinance.

Mr. A. R. Frantz, of 2500 W. Main Street a park operator objected to the six inch minimum concrete slab requirement. He further asked about the width of the lots, in the present ordinance it requires 50 ft. He stated that he felt that width of lot should not exceed 40 ft. or 45 ft. inasmuch as you can increase the tax base by having more multiple housing and on inspection of hundreds of courts this is ample depth of a lot. This will take a coach 60 ft. long and later up to 70 ft. His main concern with the ordinance is that it states a mobile home park must abut industrial. He would like to suggest that it abut commercial.

Mr. C. W. Woodruff, 3708 Delta River Drive, stated that he is a resident of the "A" zoned property. He stated he felt that Mr. Doyle covered the comments pretty well.

Mr. Ted Powell, 15378 Yorkleigh Drive, a Mobile Home Park Operator stated that some planners feel that the area next to industrial is not conducive to the best residences. He referred to the August issue of NATIONS CITIES magazine and an article by Mr. Bear of the American Society of Planning Officials. Portions of the article were read.

Mr. Aurel Petrie, 3106 Arcadia Drive stated that he is a home owner, and advised that the area mentioned is "A" one family and wanted to know if this would be allowed.

The Secretary read a portion of the ordinance again to Mr. Petrie.

Mrs. Virginia Maier, 3730 N. East Street, a mobile home resident stated that she was opposed to being a buffer between a junk yard, industrial and residential. She advised the Board that she gave up her home and now lives in the trailer because it is easier to take care of in that she is working every day, and she does not like apartments, but doesn't want to live on Vase, or Ballard type of streets either. She mentioned Cutlerville which is about 7 miles south of Grand Rapids, and suggested that the Board look at this.

Mrs. Maier stated that her trailer has a 19 ft. jalousy which is very heavy and costly to move. Her home is not mobile. She further stated that she doesn't want to go into an industrial area. She remarked that the mobile home industry is about sixth in the state and suggested that it be kept here rather than chased away.

Mr. James Fawcett of 524 S. Walnut, Lansing, a park operator, representing Mr. Frantz presented two layouts of mobile home park designs.

Mr. Bill Gragman, Vice-president of the Michigan Multiple Housing Assn. told of the 155 spaces in Cutlerville and invited the Board to see it.

He stated he felt that it was a credit to the community.

Mrs. Helen M. Petrie, 3106 Arcadia Drive stated that she did not understand the ordinance, and was referred to the City Clerk's office to pick up a copy.

She further asked about the zoning on Delta River and was advised that this was not a hearing on specific sites and that the information was not available to the Board here in the Council Chambers as to the current zoning on this site.

Mr. L. Theroux of 610 Bailey Street asked if there would be any way that a private individual could place his mobile home on his own lot. Mr. Theroux was advised that the ordinance does not permit mobile homes in a residential area.

Mrs. Leon Martin, a resident of Franz Mobile Homes, 2344 W. Main Street stated that she was representing M.S.U. students. They are full time students and need a place to live and without \$90.00 per month rent. Feels that they are eligible to have decent homes. Feels that mobile homes for retired people are good places to live and that it is something that they can keep up.

Mr. H. F. Cogswell, of 3000 Arcadia Drive a home owner asked about the recreation

facilities. He stated he felt that mobile home should provide a decent tax base.

The City Assessor then advised that trailers themselves are exempt from real estate tax, but they must pay \$3.00 fee per trailer.

The City Treasurer then reported that payment is a specific tax and is controlled by the State Legislature and not by local legislation. Every resident is liable to pay \$3.00 per month to the local treasurer. That amount in Lansing is used \$2.00 for schools, 50c to the County and 50c to the City of Lansing. The total for the month is \$578 for the schools, \$144.50 for the County and \$144.50 for the city. Annually the city takes in close to \$7,000, the county and city both receive \$1,375 with the balance for the schools. In addition the city receives approximately 1/3 of the real estate tax, or slightly over \$5,000. The county received 1/3 and the balance is turned into the schools. The total number of trailers is 289.

Mr. T. Michael Doyle then gave the board these figures. On a \$20,000 home the taxes would be about \$241.28. On a mobile home the taxes would be \$24.00. He then stated that this would be one of the factors that creates an emotional argument. He further stated that he thought the mobile home owners should go out and get the status to pay their fair share of the taxes. He further remarked that he thought they should do some federal lobbying. The federal Housing Administration will not give mortgages that is near mobile home development or where the property is developed for high cost housing. Low cost housing is the only thing that can be mortgaged. The home owners want an equal base for taxes.

Mr. James Fawcett also had some figures for the board's consideration. There is one child for each 5 mobile homes which amounts to \$374.00 per school child. This does not include water and streets. He further stated that the average ages of persons living in the trailer parks is such that they do not have school children.

At this point Mr. Fawcett questioned Mr. Doyle's computations and the remarks about the financing by the Federal Housing Administration.

Nellie Armstrong, 2344 W. Main Street, stated that she wants a place to live. She has two children, one seventeen and one eighteen. She has a set income bracket. She wants a chance to live properly within her means.

Mr. Wade Saleske of 3008 Arcadia Drive, a home owner stated that he fully recognized the purpose of the meeting and the aims of the mobile homes ordinance and has a personal interest in this type of living. He stated that he wanted some information on the tax base. He then asked if this type of housing affects the surrounding area tax-wise.

Mr. Joseph K. Quick of 3407 W. Mt. Hope Avenue asked about a playground for children. The secretary explained the mobile home definitions for a park. This information would be considered as part of the criteria on the overall development of the park.

Mr. Roger K. Foland of 1419 Redwood Street stated that he was wondering about the proposed change from 4 inches to 6 inches of reinforced concrete, and wondered what they were going to do—drive semi's over them? Four inches was sufficient for driveways and pre-fabs. Six inch reinforced concrete slab is designed to prohibit this type of court. Nothing would be driven over them except the trailer. He questioned the lighting requirement and stated that some streets in the city have no lights at all.

Mr. George Towsley of 6726 S. Washington Avenue stated that he has lived in a trailer for about 10 years. The 50 ft. width of lot should not be a permanent size. Most trailers are 10 ft. wide. The weight is on the wheels. When jacked up and blocks placed under trailers, it will even out the weight. He is proud of his home which he feels is as good as any home and they should have the right to live in an area away from the factories and railroad tracks as well as anyone else.

Mr. Wayne Ewalt, 4553 E. Willoughby Road stated that he has lived in a mobile home for around 8 years and intends to keep this his home because of his work. He feels there should be a place furnished for these homes. He has an opportunity to talk to many people daily and they would like to buy trailers. He then informed the board of purchasing the land where his trailer is parked. For the $\frac{1}{2}$ acre he paid \$1,500.00 and by the time it was ready for the trailer he had \$3,000 invested, then the trailer is worth about \$1,500. The lot has a valuation of about \$500 including the septic tank. The taxes are about \$130.00 per year. The land valuation remains high because of the improvements and business venture. He believes the tax rate should be a pretty good thing for the city.

Mr. Leo Farhat, attorney representing Alex and Stella Patchak, of the Riverview Trailer Park, appeared and stated that he had some comments in addition to the letter he had submitted earlier to each board member. The trouble started 10 years ago, and he hoped this will resolve a lot of their differences. He mentioned the limitation on the amount of expansion, and suggested that the limitation be removed from the ordinance and left to the discretion of the Planning Board and Council.

Mr. Farhat asked further consideration in regard to subsection Q paragraph 4 relative to extensions, and suggested that those operators who have been in operation for 15 or 16 years would have to scrap their entire investment, if this is not the intention of the section, it should be clarified.

Further discussion was held on non-conforming uses.

Mr. Farhat then inquired if the staff were aware of the State requirements on health factors covering the mobile home parks and suggested the mobile trailer park law and ordinance be reviewed.

Mr. Frank Perrin advised that a subdivision ordinance might be considered that would be restricted to trailers. Lots of minimum size, dedication of streets and installation of utilities and that assessments and services be made to all as now provided to the rest of the city. Location of these trailer courts would be given greater consideration of area as far as tax base purposes. In addition, all utilities plus fuel would be placed under ground.

Mr. Farhat asked Mr. Graves about the mobile home tax figures within the City of Lansing.

Councilman Smith was introduced to the audience.

Mr. Black then asked Mr. Franz, if the Ordinance calls for 3500 ft. and 50 x 70 with the amendment that there be a setback of 25 ft. from front and 50 ft. from one trailer to another. You also suggested cutting down the width of the lots. If the total overall is 105 ft., with 40 ft. width for a total of 4200 for every lot size. Would you be willing to narrow the lots and extend the length to cover the 4200 sq. ft.? Mr. Frantz stated that he would. The average trailer is 50. There are some 55 and 60, but the 70 ft. is a custom built and would require a special lot. The average mobile home size width is up to 50 ft. This would allow more parking—45 ft. would allow two parking spaces.

Mr. Black then mentioned the thickness of the slab and stated that we should take into consideration the type of ground underneath. In some instances 4 in. would be enough with chicken wire and in another area, the building inspector could restrict the thickness of the slab depending on the basis of the soil conditions.

Mr. Ray Davis stated that he had been in real estate for 35 years and thought we were on the right track. He stated that the definitions should be divided into four categories, the permanent, which would enjoy better zoning than the small park, another zoning for different size of lots and different requirements. Also transients. Might be altered enough for 6 months to a year stay, and the camper trailer for in-transit tourists.

Mr. Bill Gragman referred to the 25 ft. front yard and stated that in Cutlerville they have 10 ft. He further told of a trailer cavalcade to be held in Cadillac and of the amount of revenue expected.

Meeting adjourned at 9:51 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

The Regulations Establishing Admission Policies of the Lansing Housing Commission were read and discussed by the Commissioners, with several suggestions for changes made.

A motion was made by Commissioner Blackall and supported by Commissioner Owen that with the changes suggested, the Regulations Establishing Admission Policies be accepted.

The motion was carried by the following votes:

Ayes: Commissioners Blackall, Oliver, Owen.—3.

Nays: None.

Unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM MATEER,
Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, February 1, 1966

Meeting was called to order at 7:36 P.M. by Chairman Russell H. Fink.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Black, Fink, Heino, Reynolds, and Siebert—5.

Absent: Bretz, Houston, and Manz—3.

HEARINGS

Z-1-66

Mr. George Parisian, part owner with Richard and Elton Powell, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 2330 Forest Road from "A" One Family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district and presented a picture of the concept. He stated that he believes there is room for apartment in the \$90 to \$100 per month class.

Mr. Fink asked the number of units, and Mr. Parisian stated they would start on a limited basis and would build whatever the market would call for. They feel that there will be a big demand for these apartments. At the present time, most areas do not have enough parking. They would provide parking facilities.

Mr. Fink asked the number of bedrooms and was advised they would be one and two. The building will be of masonry structure.

Mr. Black asked if they would maintain the road and build on both sides and was informed that they would rather use two outlots on the advice of realtors and city officials so that they will have an out on Hamelon. The outlots are on Manley Drive. They would like curved lots rather than straight ones and also the apartments would be built to conform to the contour of the curving. They want ample parking for a renting promotion in the area.

Mr. Reynolds asked if they intend to close any streets and was advised that there is no street there now. They would make provisions for this if necessary.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Mr. Houston came in at 7:40 P.M.

Z-2-66

Miss Lucile E. Belen appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 622 and 626 W. Kalamazoo Street from "D" apartment to "E" apartment-shop district and advised that this property is where the flower shop was located in 1936, and was properly zoned. In 1942, the Master Plan was adopted and this area went back to "D" apartment, but they didn't know about this until 1950. They have only needed minor repairs until this time, but now they must replace porch and supply parking. A garage is needed for the

truck and storage. The Building Inspector advised them that they would be able to use the "E" apartment rather than the "F" commercial. They have apartments upstairs.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-3-66

Mr. Simon S. Toomey appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 5100 S. Logan and 1201 W. Jolly Road from "A" one family to "E-2" drive-in shop and stated that he had been on this corner for 18 years. The property is now up for sale and it must be rezoned in order to sell.

Mr. Reynolds asked if the animal shelter was on his property and was informed that it was two or three doors to the south.

Mr. Fink asked if the gas station was in operation and was advised that it has been for the past twelve years.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-4-66

Mr. Carlton L. Kessler of Capital City Realty appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 900, 904, 906, and 910 North Pennsylvania and 1005 Oakland Street from "C" two family residential to "E-2" drive-in shop and stated that they propose to build a service station here. The area has lost its desirability as residential because of the amount of traffic and the people in these houses want to move. The houses are bungalow type and very nice. Feels that the station would be a good tax base.

Mr. Reynolds asked if this station wouldn't create a traffic problem with the hill there and Mr. Kessler stated that the hill isn't that bad.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-5-66

Mr. Byron T. Bradley appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 2321 S. Washington Avenue from "A" one family to "C" two family district and said the property in question is now used as single family. It was built in 1921, and was used for a number of years as two family. About 1940 it was sold and in 1942 reverted to "A" one. He purchased it in 1949. The building is capable of housing two families. They do not intend to change the physical structure. They added a double garage in 1959, and have

room for two more cars in the driveway so there will be no parking in the street.

Matter referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-6-66

Mr. Francis Fine appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 4400 block of N. Grand River Avenue described as:

Lot 87, Northwestern Subdivision
No. 3

from "C" two family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district and stated the property adjacent and on either side is zoned "D-M".

Mr. Fink asked if this wasn't a part of the staff recommendation earlier.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-7-66

Mr. Francis Fine appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at the Northeast corner Waverly and Jolly Roads described as:

Beginning at the Southwest corner of Section 31, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan running thence North 210 feet on the section line, thence Easterly 210 feet parallel with south line of Section 31, thence South 210 feet, thence Westerly 210 feet on the south line of Section 31 to the point of beginning.

Beginning on the section line at a point 210 feet North of the Southwest corner of Section 31, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, running thence North 730.4 feet more or less to the North line of Outlot D of Replat of Anderson's Subdivision, thence Easterly 494 feet on the North line of said Outlot D to the Northwest corner of Lot 735 of Churchill Downs No. 4, thence Southerly 662.9 feet to the Southwest corner of Lot 743 of said Churchill Downs No. 4 thence Easterly 387 feet more or less, on the South line of said Churchill Downs No. 4 to the Southeasterly line of the old New York Central Railway right-of-way, thence Southwesterly 362.1 feet on said right-of-way line to the south line of Section 31, thence Westerly 423.1 feet on the section line to a point 210 feet from the Southwest corner of the Section, thence North 210 feet parallel with west section line, thence Westerly 210 feet to the point of beginning.

from "J" parking, "F" commercial, "B" one family, "A" one family and "E-1"

drive-in shop district to "E-1" drive-in shop and "D-M" multiple dwelling district and stated that some years ago they requested the zoning that presently exists. At that time they did not own the three homes. Now they have acquired all the parcels and want to extend the size of the "E-1" because the needs today are for more than 152 ft. The rest of the area is requested for use as multiples. They will submit deed restrictions for only 12 units per acre. They would rather have this type of unit than the townhouse type.

Mr. Reynolds asked if there is a grocery store there. Mr. Fine stated that it is not used as a grocery now. This is across the street and is used as an office.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-8-66

Mr. Ben C. Morton appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 5500 S. Cedar Street from "G-2" wholesale to "H" light industrial district and informed the board that the building was formerly used for a kitchen sales. It came into the city as "A" one family. The former owner asked for "G-2," but this business is wholesale sales and manufacture and he needs a heavier zoning.

Mr. Busley informed him that he could not store a dozer. He needs the "H" so he can sell and store merchandise. The area is so small that it could never be used for something like a block company so there would be no noise.

Mr. Morton mentioned the other properties in the area that were zoned "H". The office building is 150 feet by 40 feet, and the warehouse is 34 feet by 79.4 feet, leaving about 46 feet in back. He doesn't anticipate having to expand, but if he did, would go back toward the lot line. Their work is assembling using a drill press and soldering type of operation.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-9-66

Mr. Hugo Tews appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at the Northeast corner of Christenson and Jolly Road described as:

Lot 216, Pleasant Grove Subdivision

from "A" one family residential to "C" two family district and advised he would like to use the 74 foot by 165 foot lot for one building which would house two families. The duplex would be all on one floor over a full basement.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-10-66

Mrs. Florence Pomroy appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 114 E. Hillsdale from "D" apartment to "D-1" professional offices district and stated that she has a small business. She was forced to move from the corner of Lenawee and Capitol so that the parking lot could be built, and wants to use this building for her temporary office help service. She intends to use 300 square feet for the office with parking behind the building. There is parking for one car now, but with the removal of the garage there will be room for two spaces. She would like to rent rooms. Gradually would like to improve the building, doing the outside first. She would also like the privilege of parking a car in front instead of using a sign.

Mr. Reynolds asked if her business were now across the street and was advised that it was.

Mr. Black asked if she intended to buy if it were rezoned and was told that she would.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-11-66

Mr. John A. Tysman appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 700 block of East Miller Road described as:

Commencing at the S.W. corner of Section 3, T3N, R2W, Delhi Township now City of Lansing, running East 222.5 feet thence N. 387.5 feet, more or less to a point which is 190 feet South of South line of Lot 40 of Supervisor's plat No. 3, thence westerly 222.75 feet parallel with S. line of said Lot 40, thence S. 387.5 feet, more or less to point of beginning. The West 55 feet being subject to Highway right-of-way

from "A" one residential to "F" commercial district and submitted a photo of the area and told of the usage and stated that he doesn't feel this could be used for residence. This property was formerly commercial when in the township. He has checked with the Public Service Department and was informed that the sewer is within 480 feet of the property. A petition is now in for a sewer. He presented a drawing of the proposed building.

Mr. Reynolds asked if this were the type of building and the petition stated that it would depend on the tenants.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-12-66

Mr. John Chase of LaNoble Realty Company appeared in behalf of the petition to

rezone the property at 1209 and 1217 W. Saginaw from "B" one family to "D-M" multiple district and presented some pictures and told of the surrounding area use. He further presented a petition signed by the neighbors. They will abide with any and all recommendations of the Board. They have set no limit on the number of apartments, and will fence the lot lines. They plan on two bedroom units.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-13-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 3322 Westmont Avenue from "A" one family residential to "C" two family apartment district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-14-66

Mr. Joe D. Pentecost, agent for Hospitality Inn, Inc. appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the vacant corner Collins Road and Cavanaugh Road Connector from Agricultural-Residential "A" one to "F" commercial district and advised that they will present site plans later. Mr. Max Roger is the engineer. Their plans call for 100 units motor hotel of a luxurious nature, a ball room for 300 people, sauna baths, indoor heated swimming pools, playground, terrace dining, and a nine hole range. Fifteen to twenty acres are to be developed now and the balance to be used later for professional offices. Sewages is now a problem.

Mr. Reynolds asked where they get on I-496 and was advised that they would come off Dunkel Road.

Mr. Leland Carr representing Michigan State University appeared and stated that they were objecting. He further stated that Act 124 of the Public Acts set aside money for planning and Michigan State Police would like to have this for their headquarters. They have been surveying the area. The university owns the site where the police are now.

Mr. Pentecost stated that he would be happy to negotiate with Michigan State but he is legally bound to an agreement with the petitioner which was signed about three weeks earlier.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-15-66

Mr. Stanley Stelmashenko of the Walter Neller Company appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 820 N.

Chestnut Street from C two to "D-M" and advised that they have acquired 13,000 sq. ft. giving them access to Madison. They now have the whole corner which they wish to use for one and two unit apartments.

Petitioner was advised to submit a letter to City Council amending the petition to include his additional property.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-16-66

Mr. H. J. Scherer appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 2200 S. Cedar from "C" two family to West 60 feet multiple dwelling and East 37.6 "F" commercial district and advised that this area has been black topped and used in conjunction with several businesses before his purchasing it late October. The area has been used for parking for 20 years.

Mr. Reynolds asked if he anticipated enlarging the commercial on the corner, and the petitioner advised that he does not own this. He owns the property in front of it. He has a new car agency and needs the additional area. Directly to the north is a used car lot and 170 ft. is used in conjunction with a business in the next block. Adjacent to that is "F" commercial and is owned by the petitioner.

Mr. Fink asked if there was a house on the lot and Mr. Scherer stated that it is vacant.

Mr. Siebert asked about the high bank and was advised that there was a five foot elevation on the lot line running to the west which is about 50-51 ft. from the house.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-17-66

Mr. Patsy Verderese appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 5900 Block of South Pennsylvania Avenue described as:

Lot 28 and com. N.W. cor. Lot 28
thence E. 132 ft., N. 25 ft., W. 132 ft.,
S. 25 ft. to beg.; Pleasant Ridge Plat

Lot 29 Pleasant Ridge Plat

from "A" one family residence to "D-M" multiple dwelling district and advised he would like the lot rezoned for multiple.

Mr. Fink asked if he wanted to put up an apartment building and the petitioner stated they would like to construct 8 to 10 units. They have no plans yet.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-18-66

Mrs. Mary MacDonald Leonard, President of Central Welding Supply Co., Inc. appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 214 Reasoner Street from "H" light industrial to "I" heavy industrial district and advised that it was rezoned in 1964, and this request is for the same type of rezoning as before—for the storage of liquid oxygen container.

Mr. Reynolds asked why they needed 900 ft. before and now are asking for 1200 ft. Mrs. Leonard stated that this is in a different section. They have had this in their building plans and this is a better place for the unit inasmuch as it is not adjacent to a dwelling.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-19-66

Mr. Howard DeWolf representing Duard L. Jones and Charles H. Gass owners of General Pictures appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 5202 and 5208 South Pennsylvania Avenue from "D-1" to "F" commercial district and advised that they have a commercial photographic studio and multilith printing operation. The reason for the request is that part of their business is non-conforming under the "D-M". They will be forced to vacate their present business because of Urban Renewal and they wish to construct a new building on the site. He told of the frontage and the use of the surrounding area. A sketch was presented. Parking will be off Sims and a drive-in area will allow for expansion. May use basement in present house. Building of block construction on two elevations. Photo Lab in S.E. area, art studio and general office with multilith to center back. They feel the request is justified. The area is in contention from time to time. The left side of Pennsylvania has quite a variety of miscellaneous types of buildings. They feel that this type of building will tend to give this area a lift and might encourage others to develop the area nicer.

Mr. Siebert asked about the prospectus from Sims side and asked about parking.

Mr. Fink asked if it would be necessary for curb cuts and was advised that Sims is gravel.

Mr. Reynolds stated that in the interest of good traffic movement on Pennsylvania it would be nice to have a service road to eliminate curb cuts.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Recess from 8:48 to 9:41 P.M.

Mrs. Bretz came in at 9:35 P.M.

Motion by Houston, seconded by Bretz that the Board officially adopt the land use concept to the city and state government.

Some discussion was held on the possible variances in the plan.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

BUSINESS SESSION

Mr. Fink gave an explanation of the Zoning Process.

COMMITTEES

ZONING COMMITTEE AND REZONINGS

Z-138-65

Motion by Houston, seconded by Bretz that the petition by Bruce Hartwick to rezone a parcel at 2531 N. Grand River Avenue from "A" one family and "J" parking to "F" commercial and "D-M" multiple dwelling district revised to Community Unit Plan be tabled to the mid-month meeting and the developer be asked to present a better site plan.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-185-65

Motion by Houston, seconded by Bretz that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Anthony P. Nosal to rezone a parcel at 2233 and 2323 W. Holmes Road from "A" one family district to "F" commercial district be denied.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as residential.

Plans for platting of this area for residential use have been established which include the necessary stub streets for proper access.

Platting should precede any zoning or further structural development of the land.

Potential residential areas should be protected against the encroachment of commercial uses and vice versa.

The existing commercial facilities adjacent and to the east, both size and loca-

tion wise, fit quite well into the development of this area.

Enlargement of the commercial facilities would be contrary to shopping center standards, and detract from the over-all plan.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-205-65

Motion by Houston, seconded by Bretz that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Walter Neller Co., R. L. Lyons, to rezone a parcel at 738-740 N. Pennsylvania Avenue from "C" two family district to "D-M" multiple district be denied.

The density allowed in the "D-M" district exceeds the density proposed on the Master Land Use Plan.

"C" two family allows reasonable use of the land and permits development compatible with the area east of Pennsylvania.

Sewers in the area are presently overloaded and change of density would only compound the problem.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-211-65

Motion by Houston, seconded by Bretz that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by B and H Enterprises, Inc. to rezone a parcel in the 1000 block Dennis Street

Lot No. 50 Plat of Battenfield Subdivision No. 2

from "A" one family district to "C" two family district be granted subject to the property owner filing for approval of a minor plat, allowing two lots, more equal in size, which would allow two duplex dwellings to be constructed.

Motion carried by the following vote.

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-213-65

Motion by Houston, seconded by Bretz that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by George Charlie to re-

zone a parcel at 1616 Linval Street from "C" two family district to "F" commercial district amended to "H" light industrial be denied.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates the area as residential.

The change would be contrary to the land use pattern of the area, which is predominantly residential.

This change would create an isolated district unrelated to similar districts, i.e. this would be a spot zone.

The basic land use conditions have not changed in the area.

"H" light industrial zoning allows uses that should be physically separated from residential uses.

The change would constitute a grant of a special privilege to an individual as contrasted to the general welfare.

The Board believes that the existing zoning allows reasonable use of the land.

Mr. Black expressed regret that it would be necessary for this type of denial but when Mrs. Bretz informed him of the letters to City Council objecting to this operating, Mr. Black withdrew his comments.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Heino, Houston, Reynolds, Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Abstain: Fink—1.

Z-217-65

Motion by Houston, seconded by Bretz that the board recommend to City Council that the petition by Leon Pung Plastering Company to rezone a parcel in the 900 block Holten

Lot 49 and the north 20 ft. of Lot 50 Oakdale Addition

from "B" one family district to "C" two family district be denied.

Rezoning of this parcel would create an isolated district unrelated to similar districts, i.e. this would be a spot zone.

This request, if granted, would trigger requests to allow remodeling and converting of other single family dwellings in the area.

The basic land use conditions have not changed in this area warranting the change of zoning.

This change would constitute a grant of special privilege to an individual as contrasted to the general welfare.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be used in accord with the existing zoning.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Reynolds, Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-218-65

Motion by Houston, seconded by Bretz that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Mr. Abood to rezone a parcel at 520 Lincoln from "B" one residential district to "J" parking district be granted and screening be provided along the east property line except for the residential set-back on Lincoln Ave.

Screening to consist of one of the following:

1. A 6 ft. high cyclone type fence with interwoven slats.
2. A 3 ft. high cyclone type fence with dense evergreen plantings of a mature height of 5 ft. to 5 ft. 6 in. in height.
3. A 5 ft. high redwood or cedar louvered fence with boards running perpendicular to the ground.

Low evergreen plantings be provided within the residential set-back on Lincoln Avenue.

Lighting to be provided on the parking area at a minimum of 2/10 lumens light per sq. ft. so directed on the area so as passing motorists and adjacent properties will not be affected.

1. The Master Land Use Plan indicates a sub-community shopping center at this location.
2. The "J" parking zone as requested will provide a proper transition between the commercial frontage on Cedar Street and the residential area to the east, and further help to relieve the traffic and off-street parking problems in the immediate area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Abstain: Siebert—1.

Z-219-65

Motion by Houston, seconded by Bretz that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by General Motors Cor-

poration to rezone a parcel on the block bounded by William St., Division St., Olds Ave., and Butler Blvd.

Block 2, Morrison's Subdivision of Block 16, Townsend's Subdivision on the North $\frac{1}{2}$ of Section, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, except the North $\frac{1}{2}$ of Lot 1, and the South 66 ft. of Lots 17 and 18, and the South 90 ft. of the East 21 $\frac{1}{3}$ ft., of Lot 16, Block 2, said Morrison's Subdivision, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "J" parking district to "I" heavy industrial district be granted and

The North $\frac{1}{2}$ of Lot 1, Block 2, Morrison's Subdivision of Block 16 of Townsend's Subdivision of the North $\frac{1}{2}$ of Section 20, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

be rezoned from "F" commercial district to "I" heavy industrial.

The Board further recommends that the balance of the property in the block described as the

South 66 ft. of Lots 17 and 18 and the south 90 ft. of the East 21 $\frac{1}{3}$ of Lot 16, Block 2 Morrison's Subdivision, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

be rezoned from "F" commercial to "I" heavy industrial.

This area falls within the proposed industrial complex as indicated on the Master Land Use Plan.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Reynolds, Siebert.

Nays: None.

Z-220-65

Motion by Houston, seconded by Bretz that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by T. Pauline Fleming to rezone a parcel at 1738 Glenrose Ave. from "C" two family district to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied.

The Board believes that the previous change of zoning was reasonable and was in keeping with the intent of the Master Plan.

"D-M" multiple zoning would allow a density and structure out of character with the established residential area.

The change would alter the population density pattern and thereby increase the load on public facilities (schools, sewer, and streets).

The existing and proposed land use conditions have not changed in this area.

The change will adversely affect living conditions in the immediate area, principally through an increase in traffic and activity.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot continue to be used under the existing zoning.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-222-65

Motion by Houston, seconded by Bretz that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Roosevelt Watson to rezone a parcel at 924 Riverview from "B" one family to "G" business district be denied.

The Board believes that the existing residential area should be protected against non-residential uses until such time as the area develops on a larger scale for industrial use.

This area is proposed for future industrial use on the Master Land Use Plan.

Zoning should be set up and used to assure that land, appropriately located and otherwise suitable will be preserved and kept available to meet the future needs of industry.

Potential industrial areas thus should be protected against the encroachment of non-industrial uses.

The basic land use conditions (residential) have not changed.

The change would adversely affect living conditions in the immediate area principally through an increase in traffic and activity.

The "G" business district zoning allows 100% land coverage, with no provisions for off-street parking.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-223-65

Motion by Houston, seconded by Bretz that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by John P. Miller to rezone a parcel in the 4000 block of South Pennsylvania Avenue,

541 and 542, Maple Hill Subd., City of Lansing

from "A" one family district to "J" parking district be granted.

A minimum of 2/10 lumens light per sq. ft. be provided on the parking area, so directed so as not to affect adjacent properties or passing motorists.

Screening to consist of continuous evergreen plantings with a mature height of 4 ft. to 5 ft. 6 in. on the west and south lines of the "J" parking area except for a 20 ft. setback along the south line on Pennsylvania Avenue and that low evergreen plantings be provided within said 20 ft. setback.

The property has direct access to a major thoroughfare.

Additional off-street parking is necessary for the existing use, and will help to relieve, or possibly eliminate, any on-street parking that now exists in the area.

This change is not contrary to the existing land use pattern.

The basic land use conditions have changed in this area fronting along Pennsylvania Avenue.

This change will not discourage the improvement or development of adjacent property in accord with the existing regulations.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-224-65

Motion by Houston, seconded by Bretz, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Reinhart Hasselbring to rezone a parcel in the 200 block of N. Clippert Street

Lots Numbered 47, 48, 49, 50, and 51 of Alamo Heights Subd., City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one family district to "F" commercial district be granted.

That the East 120 ft. of the north 140 ft.

of the property be rezoned from "A" one family district to "F" commercial and the

Balance of the property

be rezoned from "A" one family district to "J" parking district.

The Board further recommends that:

The East one-half of the vacated alley lying contiguous to the west line of the subject property

be zoned "J" parking.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this property as commercial.

Past rezoning and development of the area has been other than residential.

This change will not be contrary to the existing and proposed Land Use Plan.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-225-65

Motion by Houston, seconded by Bretz that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Charles R. Green Realty to rezone a parcel in the 2400-2500 block Wabash Road

Outlot B—Manley Subdivision, a part of the E. $\frac{1}{2}$ of the S.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ Section 26, T4N, R2W, Lansing Township, Now City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one family district to "C" two family district be denied.

The Board further suggests that the property owner develop under the Community Unit Plan with a density and building development compatible with the surrounding area.

This change would be contrary to the established land use pattern which is developed in 2-3 dwelling units per net acre.

The change would adversely affect living conditions in the immediate area, principally through an increase in traffic and activities.

This change would create an isolated district unrelated to similar districts, i.e. this would be a spot zone.

The basic land use conditions have not changed in this area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-226-65

Motion by Houston, seconded by Bretz, that the Board recommend to City Council

that the petition by John Bean to rezone a parcel at 815 W. Lenawee from "C" two family district to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied.

This rezoning would allow a density exceeding what is proposed for the area.

The use and development allowed in the "D-M" multiple district would be out of character with the existing development in the area.

This change would create an isolated district, i.e. this would be a spot zone.

The basic land use conditions have not changed in this area.

The change will adversely affect living conditions in the immediate area principally through an increase in traffic and activity.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot continue to be used under the existing zoning.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-228-65

Motion by Houston, seconded by Bretz that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Mrs. W. G. Reeves to rezone a parcel at 5207 South Cedar Street described as follows:

The northeast quarter of the northeast fractional quarter of Section 4 in Town 3 North, Range 2 West, Michigan, excepting the north 6 acres thereof, and also excepting the electrical railroad right-of-way containing 24 acres of land, more or less also excepting a parcel of land heretofore conveyed by first parties to Louis W. Hatt and Alma Hatt, husband and wife, May 16, 1924, described as commencing 403 ft. south of the north line of said section 4 and 310 ft. east of the line of the M. U. T. (said electrical) right-of-way; thence south 225 ft., east 50 ft., north 225 ft., west 50 ft., to beginning

from "A" one family district to "F" commercial district as filed be denied.

The Board further recommends that the portion of the property described as:

Commencing 240 feet north of the southwest corner thereof thence north 120 ft., thence east 200 ft., thence northeasterly 738.1 ft. to a point on the north of the property, said point being 495 ft. west of the northeast corner of the property, thence east 495 ft.

thence south 838.63 ft., thence west 864.5 ft. along the north line of Cedarway Homesites Subdivision, thence northwesterly 312.3 ft. to a point 200 ft. east of the point of beginning, thence west 200 ft. to beginning except the north 180 ft.

be rezoned from "A" one family to "F" commercial.

The property was annexed to the City September 30, 1960, and became non-conforming use at this time.

The owners are limited to the type of improvements that can be made under the non-conforming status.

Because of the existing use of the property and the need for modern facilities, it would be unreasonable to deny the request.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-229-65

Motion by Houston, seconded by Bretz that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by John Spagnuolo to rezone a parcel in the 2000 block Wood Street

Lot No. 1 Bancroft Hills, a Subdivision on part of the S.W. $\frac{1}{2}$ of Section 2, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan; subject to any and all easements and/or restrictions of record

from "A" one family district to "C" two family district be granted.

The Board believes that the change will not have an adverse effect on the area and will provide somewhat of a transition zone between Wood Street and the single family residential to the east.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-142-64

Motion by Houston, seconded by Bretz that the Board recommend to City Council that after considering the request from the Board of Trustees of the First Church—Methodist and Evangelical United Brethren asking that the screening requirements be waived along the east line of the property located at 4301 South Waverly Road, that the request be granted until such

time as the property is developed for residential purposes or any other changing conditions making it necessary to enforce the previously required screening.

The Board believes that this recommendation is in keeping with the intent of the Code, and will not have an adverse effect on the surrounding area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-188-65

Motion by Houston, seconded by Bretz that the matter be removed from the table.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Motion by Houston, seconded by Bretz that the Board recommend to City Council that the Board in examining this petition discussed a length and considered the following factors:

1. The staff's report and staff discussions.
2. The economic report submitted for the Kahres Farm by Larry Smith and Associates dated September 14, 1964.
3. The location of a regional center with its area of impact or trade area if located in the proposed site would have a detrimental effect on the general welfare and the business community as a whole, in particular the central business district and outlying commercial center, would be adversely affected. This would result because the trade area of the proposed regional shopping center would overlap these existing commercial facilities.
4. The proposed regional center at this site could deteriorate the total tax base due to loss of sales in other existing commercial developments. This type of market deterioration has been the basic cause of commercial blight.
5. If a regional center were developed to the west of Lansing as has been discussed, then its impact would not necessarily affect the existing trade area as greatly as would the proposed development. It is assumed that a regional shopping center development to the west would be near the Saginaw I-96 interchange with development to take place no earlier than five years hence.

6. In the development of the Land Use and Marketability Study for Downtown Urban Renewal Project No. 1, Larry Smith and Associates, economic consultants, in a report dated October, 1963, outlined the key assumptions for potential strengthening of the central city and the overall city tax base as follows: (These potentials based on the assumption that a new major department store will be located in the central city area).

"The addition of a new major department store is the key assumption in the forecast of over \$17 million in additional Lansing CBD sales by 1970. It is probable the sales increase would be less than one-third this amount without a new department store in the CBD, and even lower should a new major department store unit enter the Lansing market through a suburban location.

The availability of prime sites for a department store, office buildings, a motor hotel and apartments offers substantial opportunities to local investors who may wish to participate in redevelopment action. The new facilities, if developed in reasonable relationship to market demand, will not subject other CBD facilities to unusual competitive pressures.

The City of Lansing, in return for its investment in the project area, will realize a strengthened tax base, with obsolete, outmoded structures replaced by new, high-value facilities, both within the project area and from new construction stimulated outside the project area by CBD revitalization. The potential increase in assessed valuation and tax revenue from the project area can be estimated in dollar terms upon the completion of the redevelopment plan and the reuse appraisal.

Finally, the entire Lansing community will benefit from a strong and attractive central business district, which can serve a wide variety of interests and activities and stand as a fitting representative of the City of Lansing.

7. The Board believes that in the interest of the existing tax base and the business of the community—maintaining the general welfare is a major factor when considering the proposed development.

The Board therefore recommends that the plan be approved subject to the following:

That the site statistics submitted for the petitioner by Johnson, Johnson, and Roy with the original petition be approved.

That the alignment of Edgewood Blvd. and the land use relationships be as shown on the second proposal.

That a preliminary plat for the entire area be submitted with final platting to be determined in accordance with the actual land development.

That a satisfactory arrangement of ingress and egress from S. Cedar Street to the area be coordinated with the Michigan State Highway Department.

That access be acquired to the property from Miller Road between Gardenia and S. Cedar St.

That the overall concept be approved including the following:

That single family development contain a minimum of 50 acres with an average lot size of 75 ft. by 120 ft.

That the town house area to be limited to a density of 10 units per net acre.

That garden apartment area be limited to a density of 18 units per acre.

The total acreage of town house and garden apartment development to be finalized with the submission of a detailed site plan.

That high rise apartment area be limited to a site adjacent to a park area and a commercial area and contain a maximum density of 50 per acre.

That the additional land acquired, (approximately 20 acres) north of Edgewood, be included in the plan for development as single family residential, park site, or a church site.

That the shopping center be developed as a community center, according to the site statistics, prepared by Johnson, Johnson and Roy, and as originally submitted with the first site plan proposal. This would allow 22.9 acres for the shopping center complex, exclusive of the other commercial uses such as office center, motor hotel, drive-in bank, and theater complex. This should be developed with a maximum gross floor space of 185,700 sq. ft. and a ratio of 4 sq. ft. of parking area to one square foot of gross floor area plus landscaping. The other commercial uses should be developed with their own off-street parking.

That the park area as proposed (3.3 acres) be increased by five acres for a total of 8.3 acres.

That the development approval be valid for a period of one year from the date of Council approval with a re-analysis and review by the Planning Board and City Council to be considered prior to extension of approval. Extension of approval may be granted at the request of the petitioner, the normal review procedures.

The following discussion ensued.

Mr. Houston stated that in essence, at this point, you will notice that the recommendation be reviewed at the end of each year. The developers can come back to the board of record of one year hence or to Council one year hence and request the

same thing again, and the board or council recognized this without, and take it under review.

The Secretary then stated that this is not the intent of the Staff's recommendation, it is the staff's firm belief, based on adequate information, that a regional center at this site would be harmful to the City of Lansing and to the other existing commercial uses in terms of East Lansing, Frandor and the other areas. The recommended city policy is one which allows a community center.

Mr. Houston then remarked, What I am saying here is this, is that when you, in the motion, stated that it be reviewed by the Planning Board and City Council one year hence, now with all reasonableness it is conceivable to say that this might mean that the Planning Board of record one year hence would be bound to consider the petition at that time. He could come back in and request the same thing. The staff could continue to recommend denial, but the language is quite clear. How else could you put it.

The Secretary then stated that because we are working with an area of 200 acres or more, which is really a city in itself, a small town, it's obvious that no approval by this Board or the Council will allow the developer flexibility, and reasonableness of the proper development of the site without review procedure. In order to develop a complex in a situation such as this, it will have to be reviewed annually. In other words, you can't look a specific plan and say this is it, on this large an area. The intent for review here is only so minor problems as they derive in the design can be worked out. It is not the intent to review the addition of larger retail uses. In order to allow good development both for the developer and the city it takes co-operative movement and needs flexibility so that it needs this kind of an annual review.

Mr. Houston then said that he was not quibbling about intent, but I am just telling you what the language indicates. The language indicates the right of the individual to come back and petition for revision of their plan one year hence, and there is nothing in the language to indicate different.

The Secretary then stated that he would recommend that the language be not written this way. This is clearly not the intent.

Mrs. Bretz stated that this is not what she thought was intended either.

The Secretary then said that there is no way any of us to know how this project will finally develop. It is a fine project, and a fine development, but it will undoubtedly take many adjustments and there

has to be a system established to process this, so that it can be worked out.

Mr. Fink: You're saying here, as a staff, that function of the general concept of the specific uses within the project would remain pretty much as indicated here in the plan, rather than the change of so many acres to a future development larger or smaller as the case might be.

Mrs. Bretz: This is what we intended.

Mr. Reynolds: This goes back to the old thing, everyone is always worrying about industrial development encroaching on residential but this gets back to the same thing happening here. If the wording of Mr. Houston is such that a couple of years from now, we will go back and try to look at this thing, we will have a residential area built up around here and there will be umpteen people screaming about zoning commercial next to them, which means that if we were going to go back, we could never rezone any more because the people in the area objecting to it. After the project is built they would put a house next to it.

Based on the foregoing discussion, the following letter was sent to Council.

On September 23, 1965, a zoning petition was filed by the Walter Neller Company for a Community Unit Plan approval for property known as the Kahres Farm at 6326 S. Cedar Street. The proposed plan was for the development of a complete community consisting of single family, multi-family, office, and neighborhood shopping center which was proposed to be expanded, some time in the future, to a community shopping center.

On December 6, 1965, the Walter Neller Company submitted a letter requesting an amendment to the original plan proposing that a 40 to 45 acre site to accommodate some major retailers on the site be approved.

On January 11, 1966, a schematic site plan for tentative development of the site was presented to the Planning Board.

The Planning Board on February 1, 1966 approved, with revisions, a modification of the original plan submitted on September 23, 1965. The Board did not approve the plan with the proposed amendment requesting authorization of the 40 to 45 acre commercial site.

The Board is required under 36-7 of the Zoning Ordinance to study the plan, to report and to hold a public hearing thereon. If the Board approves the plans they are to be submitted together with the recommendation of the Board to the City Council for consideration. The Board is now returning the plans to the Walter Neller Company for revision in accord with the plan as approved by the Planning Board

on February 1st. This report is forwarded for your information.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Houston, Reynolds, Siebert—6.

Nays: Heino—1.

STREETS COMMITTEE

Assessors Plats

Mr. Houston recommended that the following letter be sent to the City Assessor:

The Planning Board at their regular meeting on February 1, 1966 considered a memo from the City Assessor requesting the waiver of public improvements in the consideration of "Assessor's Plats."

The Board adopted the following:

Inasmuch as the Michigan State Plat Act does not specifically require public improvements on an Assessor's Plat, and the Lansing Subdivision Regulations grants the Planning Board the power to vary the improvement regulation in the public interest, the Board may waive the public improvement requirements in the consideration of "Assessor's Plats" for the City of Lansing. Any such waiver, however, will be granted only after normal processing and review of the particular plat, and upon the recommendation of the Planning Staff.

The Board and Department recognize the advantages of an "Assessor's Plat" and appreciate its purpose of clarifying questionable and confusing land descriptions. We believe that in the majority of cases the plat will be justified and the public improvements requirement shall be waived. In the same sense, however, we also recognize the possibility of various ramifications that may become apparent on a particular plat which would not warrant the improvements waiver. It is therefore suggested that any plans for an "Assessor's Plat" should be submitted to the Planning Department in a preliminary or sketch form for discussion and recommendation prior to the formal submission of the plat.

ROW-3-66

Motion by Houston, seconded by Reynolds that the Board recommend to City Council that at the regular meeting of the Planning Board on February 1st, the Board considered the vacating of the alley in the 100 block of N. Homer St. described as:

That un-named alley approximately 18.9 ft. wide, more or less, located to the West of, and adjacent to Lots numbered 61, 60, 59, 58 and the south ½ of Lot No. 57, and continuing at a width of 16 ft., more or less, along and adjacent to the north lines of Lots

numbered 62, 63, 64, and 65, which lots are part of the Plat of East View Subdivision of a part of the west ½ of the northeast ¼ of Section 14, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

and recommends that the vacation be granted.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

ORDINANCE

Motion by Black, seconded by Bretz that the board recommend to City Council that a public hearing be held on the amendment to the Zoning Ordinance regarding yard requirements on Tuesday, February 22, 1966 at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1 of City Hall.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Motion by Houston, seconded by Reynolds that the Bridge over Ottawa Street should be recommended within the 6-year program.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

Motion by Heino, seconded by Reynolds that the Capital Improvements program be approved.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Houston, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

PLANNING DIRECTOR

The Secretary informed the board that the work program would be included as a part of the Budget for the 1966-67 fiscal year and suggested that a committee of the Whole meeting be held.

Meeting was set for Friday, February 4, 1966 at 7:00 P.M. at a place to be determined later.

Meeting adjourned at 11:30 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

C/M

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, March 1, 1966

Meeting was called to order at 7:36 P.M.
by Chairman Russell Fink.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Bretz, Fink, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—5.

Absent: Black, Heino and Houston—3.

HEARINGS

Z-227-65

Public hearing on the Community Unit Plan submitted by Lee Halstead for property located in the 900-1000 Blk. of Allegan St. and the 900-1000 Blk. of Washtenaw Avenue.

The Secretary presented the principles of the Community Unit Plan.

Mr. James A. Church, Senior Planner, presented the Master Plan projections and uses in the area.

Mr. Kenneth Black came in at 7:40 P.M.

Mr. Lee Halstead, developer, gave an explanation of the project. He stated that he plans on two buildings, with 30 one-bedroom units on Allegan and of 36 on Washtenaw. The parking will be hidden behind the buildings. There will be a 20 ft. driveway between the buildings using a curved path. It will be well landscaped. It will be 4 ft. higher on Allegan than on Washington which will conceal the parking, making it below eye level. He will have screening along all lot lines. A rendering of the type of buildings was presented, and he stated that he believes they will be harmonious to the neighborhood.

Some comments were made on the densities as compared to other structures similar to the proposed project.

Mr. Halstead advised that the ginko tree will be preserved.

Mrs. Isobel Brennen, 916 W. Allegan discussed the other types of developments for

this area, and stated that there is no room in the other developments with rentals in the neighborhood of \$135 and \$140.00 per apartment.

Mr. Ralph Taylor of 812 Sparrow asked several questions regarding the plan and the way it is to be approved and developed.

Mrs. Mabel French, 926 W. Allegan stated that she was in favor of the plan and asked about the time table of the purchase of the property involved. She further asked if it is to be federally financed and was told that it would not be, and that there would be no discrimination.

Mr. John Bradman who owns 914 and 918 W. Washtenaw stated that he was very much impressed and in favor of it.

Mr. Jonathan Watts asked what consideration was given to the Butler-Logan pair. Mr. Watts then explained that he had previously petitioned for rezoning and was informed of the street extension that would be coming through this area. He stated that he is in favor of the project.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-155-65

Mr. John R. Murphy appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 4903 N. Grand River Avenue from "A" one family residence to "F" Commercial revised to "H" Light Industrial and "D-M" Multiple dwelling district. Mr. Murphy advised that he wants to change the zoning to something that he can use. They would like to beautify it all with an office or apartments. There is now an old service station with apartments and 5 overnight cabins on the property with vacant land behind.

Mr. Reynolds asked if they were given suitable zoning would the existing buildings be torn down and Mr. Murphy advised that the Planning Committee had recommended the "E" so that the office could be on the main floor.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-191-65

Mr. Gordon L. Long appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 1820 E. Miller Road from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district and stated that they had originally requested the rezoning of 19 lots to "C" Two Family and Multiple. They didn't have a prepared plan. There were no objections to the Board, but when it got to the Council hearing there were some objections. From Waycross south to the turnpike is tentatively approved by Council for "A" One Family subject to the installation of sewer and water. They wish to develop two family and four family. They want 9 of these designated lots used into 4 apartments. They will deed restrict same. Each lot is larger than one-half acre. Lots will be staggered. He presented a picture of the four family dwellings. They propose 20 two-family buildings. Three will be 2 bedroom. The 4 family will be 76 ft. and the duplexes 72 ft. They will develop 78 residential lots next to these. They want them to look nice.

Mr. Paul Collier asked about the water situation. The Secretary explained that the area would be platted and this would mean storm sewer which would alleviate some of the water now standing.

Mr. Wendell McComb of Norburn Way stated that he felt the roadway would be to their advantage as at present there is a traffic problem with the hill.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-20-66

Mr. A. Mark Battaglia of Capital Advertising Agency, Inc. appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 814 N. Capitol Avenue from "D-M" multiple dwelling to "D-1" professional offices district and stated that he had appeared before the Planning Board in October, 1964 and requested approval on 534 N. Capital. They moved into this in February, of 1965 and now have been informed that in April, Lansing Community College intends to purchase the property. They would like to use this property for their business. Their business or methods have not changed. They have no walk-in type of business. They are seeking to build a structure on this land. The restriction of the current owner is that the present building must be removed. They have been in the advertising business for approximately 14 years and would like to remain in the downtown area. They do not prefer a large office building. They have only ten employees and their needs are similar to that of an accounting office. There is no large commercial sign involved. Mr. Battaglia told of the housing in the surrounding area. The depth of the lot would allow them parking space. They would like a

small office building and would blackout the parking area.

The Secretary asked Mr. Battaglia about the tightness of the mortgage money and Mr. Battaglia explained that in his type of operation where he wants his own building and does not want to have renters, money is somewhat scarce.

Mr. Black stated that about $\frac{1}{2}$ block away is zoned professional, and then it was brought to his attention that part of this block is used for parking. Mr. Battaglia then stated that some of the lots are very shallow and would not have space for parking of 10 to 12 cars.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-21-66

Mrs. John Turner appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 6911 S. Cedar St. and 1300 and 1301 Brookdale St. from "A" one family residential to "F" commercial and stated that her husband has the Murphy Safe Company. This property was zoned commercial in the township and they have outgrown the building and want to build an enlargement to the present structure. They have one employee. Five or six cars are the minimum to be parked on the property.

Mr. Reynolds asked about the structures and was advised that there are two houses on Brookdale. Mrs. Turner stated that they need a large area for trucks to come in. They have just acquired the additional property. It was advertised as commercial but was not zoned as such.

Z-22-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 3327 W. Holmes Road from "A" one family residence to "C" two family.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-23-66

Mr. Paul C. Bent appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 2800 Block of Pleasant Grove Road described as:

Beginning on the East line of Pleasant Grove Road 75 ft. North of the East and West $\frac{1}{4}$ line of Section 29, T4N, R2W, Township of Lansing, thence North 75 ft., thence East 150 ft., thence South 75 feet, thence West 150 ft. to beginning.

from "A" one family residential to "C" two family residence district and advised that he is owner of the lot and desires to

place a residence on the lot, and feels that it would lend itself well to two family. He believes that the community can use this type of structure. He would like to live on one side and rent the other.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-24-66

Mr. Malcolm L. Milks appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 820 N. Capitol Avenue from "D-M" multiple dwelling to "D-1" Professional offices district and stated that he had acquired the option and would like to build an apartment building to live in and have his office. This is immediately north of Battaglia in the Central Business area expanding to the north. He would like a 12 unit apartment with office. He presented a set of blue prints. The structure will be of colonial type the same as Edgemont. He will provide adequate parking and the structure will be compatible with Battaglia's plans. His business will create no great amount of traffic.

Mr. Reynolds asked if he had more units than allowed in the "D-M" and was told that he wants 12 units.

Mr. Black asked if there would be parking for 12 apartments and was advised that there would be.

Mrs. Dorothy Wildt asked about parking spaces.

Mr. Black stated that he concurred with Mrs. Wildt that the parking might not be adequate.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-25-66

Dr. Maurice C. Loree appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 120 W. Hillsdale from "D-1" professional offices to "F" commercial district and stated that he had rented to doctors formerly, but recently received a request to rent an office to a dental laboratory.

Mr. Reynolds asked if this were to be only temporary, and Dr. Loree stated that the laboratory wants to rent for two years.

Mr. Fink asked the size of the office and was informed that it would be 20 ft. by 60 ft. The lot size is 46 ft. by 100 ft.

Mr. Reynolds asked if the lab needed commercial and was advised that the Building Inspector and City Attorney gave the opinion that the lab was doing fabrication work and needed the commercial classification.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-26-66

Mr. Calvin Hildenbradt of H. & H. Builders appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 3800 Blk. Inverary described as:

Lots 389, 390, 391, 392 and 393 of Eton Downs No. 5 City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one family residence to "C" two family district and stated that he owns 10 lots. Originally it was deed restricted so that it could be used for two family duplexes. There is one lot between this and Cooley. He presented a rendering of the proposed plan.

The Secretary asked if the rezoning request was presented about two years ago and was told that the petition had been filed but was withdrawn.

Mr. Fink asked if this were for rent or for investment and was advised that it was for investment. The cost will be \$30,000 per two family unit.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-27-66

Mr. Paul A. Collier appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 1300 E. Miller Road from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district and he presented a sketch of the plans which call for 29 unit multiple. Has place for 50 cars in the back. He told of the services in the area.

Mr. Fink asked the number of bedrooms and was advised that there will be 15 two-bedroom and 14 single bedroom units.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-28-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 6810 S. Cedar Street from "A" one family to "F" commercial district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-29-66

Motion by Black, seconded by Bretz that the public hearing on the petition by Mildred E. and Thomas J. Fisher to rezone the property on South Cedar Street, First lot north of 7020 S. Cedar Street described as:

Lot No. 85 of Just-a-Mere Farm Subdivision

from "A" one family residence to "H" light industrial be tabled until April 5th.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-30-66

Mr. Charles N. Beale representing his mother Mrs. Mildred N. Beale appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 2900 Blk. N. Grand River Avenue described as:

Com. int'n N. and S. $\frac{1}{2}$ line and S'y line of 100 ft. R/W Grand River Ave., thence N. $68^{\circ} 26'$ W. 140.7 ft. S. $23^{\circ} 44'$ W. 272.45 ft. to N. bank of Grand River, S. $64^{\circ} 16'$ E. 161.55 ft. along said bank, N. $21^{\circ} 34'$ E. 284 ft. to said S. R/W line, N. $68^{\circ} 26'$ W. 10.13 ft. to beg: Section 5, T4N, R2W

from "A" one family residence to "C" two family residence district and stated that this is a transition area. They desire to build two family on one acre. She has lived here for approximately 40 years and desires to stay in the area. The structure is to be $1\frac{1}{2}$ stories of a colonial type.

Mr. Fink asked if this were west of the Community Unit Plan and was advised that it was. The Community Unit Plan expired, but it is believed that it will be carried out. This would be an extension of that plan. When her home is purchased for community unit, she will have to move and will need a new residence.

Mr. Reynolds asked if the east were zoned for community unit and Mr. Beale reported that his mother is now living to the east of this approximately 250 to 300 ft.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-31-66

Mr. Frank L. Cook appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 3804 S. Pennsylvania Avenue from "A" residential to "F" commercial district and stated that he would like to have it rezoned so that he could put a sign there. He does printing.

Mr. Black asked if he were operating a printing business and was informed that they had built the house three years ago. At that time it was understood to be commercial. He purchased the equipment and moved it here and then found that the property was improperly zoned. The property will not be changed as it is now fenced in. He has a multilith press.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-32-66

Mr. Ralph E. Oppen appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 1010 E. Greenlawn amended to include 1018 E. Greenlawn and 2600 Alpha Street from "A" Residential to "D-M" Multiple and advised the Board of the amendments, which would give him 22,450 square feet total. The land contains three houses, two are very low standard. He would like to upgrade the area and sees benefits in construction of an apartment on the site. This area is one and one-half blocks from Lansing General Hospital and he believes the hospital staff would seek rental housing in the area. The closest rental housing is on Alpha and there is a need for apartments in the area. He stated that he had talked to the neighbors and they were all in favor of the project. If the new zoning lot size requirements are passed it will be feasible to build 15 units on this land. The proposed building will be "L" shaped with parking to be provided in the back. He stated that he feels his plans with greenbelts and landscaping would be good land use even through a more difficult renting period.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-33-66

Motion by Black, seconded by Siebert that the petitioner be allowed to speak first on the agenda, because of a previous appointment out of town.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Walter O. Estes attorney for Milton E. Bailey appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 112, 110 Garden St., and 1601, 1603, 1607, 1609 S. Washington Avenue from "C-2" Family and "F" Commercial to "J" parking and "F-1" Commercial district. Mr. Estes stated that the houses on the property now are in a run down condition and Mr. Bailey is having trouble maintaining them as the cost is prohibitive. He now is renting to low income families and there have been a number of police calls. He would like to sell this to a business being relocated because of I-496. He presented a rendering to the Board. The building will cover lots on Washington and the back portion will be used for parking. He feels it will be an improvement to the neighborhood as it falls in with the trend of business on Washington. There will be show windows on Garden and S. Washington and a drive-in side on the South under a canopy. Construction will be of cement or cinder block with brick trim. The total cost will come to about \$100,000. Building will be used for soft retail goods business. They feel that it will be an improvement on South Washington. There is a 20 ft. setback which will give them enough

room so as the "F" zoning would not be sufficient.

Mr. Fink asked the number of parking spaces and was advised there would be 18.

Mr. Siebert asked if the building would be two story and was advised that there will be the main floor, a basement and a second floor.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-34-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that a public hearing be scheduled for Tuesday, April 5, 1966 on the Community Unit Plan submitted by Keith Granger for property located in the 5100 Block of S. Cedar St. if Mr. Granger has his plans submitted to the Board no later than March 17th.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-35-66

Mr. Thomas Sinas appeared in behalf of the petition by Heatherwood Farms Co. to rezone a parcel in the 200 Blk. LaSalle Blvd. described as:

Lot 161, Midway Subdivision No. 3,
City of Lansing, Michigan

from "A" one family residence to "J" parking district and advised that they would like to have this lot rezoned to afford additional parking space for patrons. There would be nothing but automobiles in this particular lot, with room for 10 to 12 cars. He presented a drawing and stated they will provide screening as required by the Board of Council. He further stated that they do not feel that "A" is the best and highest use, however, they do not propose to put any buildings on it: Their feeling is that the screening on the lot would act as a buffer for the neighbors.

Mr. Black stated in view of the shape of the lot, he questioned the accessibility of some of the parking spaces as shown on the drawing.

Mr. Edward Crouse of Heatherwood apologized for the drawing, however, stated that the information was taken from the assessor's records.

Mr. John Gambotto, 212 Kipling Blvd., appeared in protest of this petition. He stated that this is a nice neighborhood with the houses only 15 to 16 years old. He thought this zoning would be spot zoning. There were deed restrictions on the property when Heatherwood purchased it. They have gone along with them on a lot of things. They did build screening, but it should be replaced now, this was on the east side. They had property reclassified

last year and moved their office to a quonset house. They object to them using LaSalle and have complained about the trucks using a residential street. The trucks should use Howard Street. When trucks are at the unloading docks they block the sidewalks and between 1:30 and 4:00 P.M. in the afternoon cars are unable to get through. They have to contend with refrigerators and snowbanks on the side walks. The neighbors believe they have ample room on the other side (Detroit St.) and do not believe there should be any further expansion into the residential. Some where along the line the people have to be protected, and they feel that this creeping of industrial will cause deterioration to the residences.

Mr. Donald L. Montague of 124 LaSalle Blvd. stated that he has the house immediately south. If this proposal goes through it will constrict his property.

Mrs. Stewart of 2641 LaSalle Gardens stated that it will infringe on her property and it will mean more cars and trucks. Their present parking lot is not half full.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-36-66

Mr. Richard Herrmann appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 600, 606, 608, 612 N. Logan and 1014, and 1018 N. Lapeer Street from "C" two family to "J" parking district and presented an aerial photo. A national food store wishes to develop this area for expansion. They propose to put an addition of 30 ft. to the East. At the present time there is 11,108 square feet and this addition will give them 16,060 square feet in the new store. The present building will have to be rebuilt. It will face North Logan. Removal of the gas station will take place with this area used for parking. To the rear houses will be torn down and the land will be used for parking. This will provide for 99 cars. The houses to the south have been taken out and the area is now used for parking for the church. They have options to expand on Logan and it will be developed for entrances off Lapeer and Logan. There will be about 35,000 involved in the new project with about \$125,000 for interior of the store additional. He stated he feels this is a fine project for this end of town and feels it will be an excellent commercial project.

Mr. Reynolds asked if this were an enlargement of the store and was informed that the store will be enlarged, but they will tear down most of the present store. They will have a covered walk with an entrance off West Saginaw.

The Secretary asked if they would provide screening and the petitioner advised that they would.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Mr. Anthony P. Nosal commented on consideration to shopping centers.

Recess from 10:19 to 10:56 P.M.

BUSINESS SESSION

Motion by Bretz seconded by Siebert that the minutes of January 4 and January 25 be approved.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-138-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Manz that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Bruce Hartwick to rezone a parcel at 2431 North Grand River Avenue

Comm. 418 ft. S. of the intersection of the E. line of Lot 21, Townsend Subd. and S'y line N. Grand River Ave. thence S. 843 ft. more or less, to the N. bank of Grand River; thence NW'y along said bank to the W. line of Lot 24, Townsend's Subd.; thence N. 180 ft. more or less; thence E. 47 ft. more or less; then N. 140 ft.; thence E. 53 ft.; thence N. 393 ft.; thence E. 137.5 ft.; thence S. 65 ft.; thence E. 82.5 ft. to beg.

from "A" one family and "J" parking district to a Community Unit as revised be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. The Street, parking areas, and turn-around be constructed to the dimensions indicated on the site plan.
2. The three proposed apartment buildings are to contain no more than 60 dwelling units total which will create a density of 12.3 units per acre.
3. Public utilities are to be constructed to city standards with engineering plans submitted to the Public Service Department for approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
4. Screening of one of the following types be constructed along the east property line extending north 685 feet from a point approximately 160 feet north of the river. Also, 120 feet along the west property line and 53 feet along the north line adjacent to the turn-around as indicated on the approved plan.

a. A 3 or 4 ft. high cyclone type fence with dense evergreen plantings of a mature height of 6 ft. minimum or,

b. A 6 ft. high minimum cyclone type fence with interwoven slats or,

c. A 6 ft. high minimum decorative masonry wall.

5. Passage between the bowling alley, parking area and the Community Unit Plan is limited to pedestrian traffic only.
6. Flood Plain park area is to be developed with a shelter, picnic area, and an open space for sports activities and other various recreational uses.
7. Occupancy permit is to be issued only when the foregoing conditions have been met.
8. Construction to begin no later than one year from date of Council approval and building permit to be issued no later than six months from the date of Council approval.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-199-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Reynolds that the petition to rezone the property in the 1400-1500 Blk. Marquette St. described as:

Commencing northwest corner Lot 168, M. Mitschkun's Oak Grove Subd. No. 2, thence southwesterly to southwest corner Lot 168, northwesterly along northerly line Marquette Ave., 250 ft., northeasterly 200 ft. to southerly line C & O RR R/W southeasterly 250 ft. to beginning, Section 5, T4N, R2W

from "A" one family to Community Unit Plan be tabled.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-1-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the petition to rezone the property at 2330 Forest Road from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be tabled for thirty days.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-2-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Reynolds that the petition by L. E. and E. L. Belen to rezone the property at 622 and 626 W. Kalamazoo Street from "D" Apartment to "E" apartment-shop district be tabled for more information.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-3-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Simon S. and Vivian Toomey to rezone a parcel at 5100 S. Logan and 1201 W. Jolly Road.

Commencing at the N.W. corner of Lot 56 of Supervisor's Plat of Prosperity Farms, a Subdivision of a part of the N.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 5, T3N, R2W of Delhi Township, Ingham County, Michigan, and running thence E. on the N. line of said lot 56, 185.85 ft. to the W'ly line of Eaton Rapids Road, thence S.W'ly along the W'ly line of said road 123.65 ft., thence W. to the W. line of Lot 55 of said plat, and thence N. on the W. line of lots 55 and 56 to the place of beginning,

from "A" one family district to "E-2" Drive In, as filed be denied, and that the property except the west 70 ft. thereof be rezoned from "A" one family to "E-2" drive-in district.

1. The change would not be contrary to the established land use pattern.
2. Because of the mixed commercial development in the area, it would be unreasonable to deny the entire request.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-4-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Lena Angles, Robert H. Roether, James R. and Mary A. Thomas, Ernest A. and Treva D. Smith, and David J. Arts to rezone a parcel at 900, 904, 906 and 910 N. Pennsylvania and 1005 Oakland from "C" two family district to "E-2" drive in shop be denied.

1. The final plans for the widening of Oakland Street in this area are still under consideration. Acquisition of additional right-of-way will be necessary, therefore. The Board believes that any new development or change of zoning should be discouraged.
2. The Planning Board was negative when considering the rezoning request on the N.W. corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and Oakland Street. It has been the policy of this Board to preserve, whenever possible, the residential amenities of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black Bretz, Fink, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-5-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Manz that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Byron T. Bradley to rezone a parcel at 2321 S. Washington Avenue from "A" one family to "C" two family district be denied.

1. The change would be contrary to the established land use pattern.
2. The change would create an isolated district, unrelated to similar districts, i.e. this is spot zoning.
3. The change would constitute the granting of a special privilege, and would encourage other individuals in the area to request the same.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-6-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Leonard Farber to rezone a parcel in the 4400 Block N. Grand River Ave. described as:

Lot 87, Northwestern Subdivision No. 3

from "C" two family district to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be granted.

1. This change would not be contrary to the established land use pattern along Grand River Avenue.
2. The Board does not believe that the change will have an adverse affect on the adjacent properties or the surrounding area and will provide a proper transition zone between the potential industrial area to the north and the existing single family to the south.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-7-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Francis Fine to rezone a parcel at the N.E. corner of Waverly and Jolly Roads from "J" parking, "F" commercial, "A" one family, "B" one family and "E-1" drive-in to "E-2" drive in and "D-M" multiple dwelling district be granted as follows:

Beginning at the Southwest corner of Section 31, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, running thence North 210 ft. on the section line, thence E'y 210 ft. parallel with S. line of Section 31, thence S. 210 ft. thence W'y 210 ft. on the S. line of Section 31 to the point of beginning

be zoned "E-2" drive-in and

Beg. on the section line at a point 210 ft. N. of the S.W. corner of Section 31, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, running thence N. 730.4 ft. more or less, to the N. line of Outlot D of Replat of Anderson's Subdivision, thence E'y 494 ft. on the N. line of said Outlot D to the N.W. corner of Lot 735 of Churchill Downs No. 4, thence S'y 662.9 ft. to the S.W. corner of Lot 743 of said Churchill Downs No. 4, thence E'y 387 ft. more or less, on the S. line of said Churchill Downs No. 4 to the S.E'y line of the old New York Central Railway right-of-way, thence S.W'y 362.1 ft. on said right-of-way line to the S. line of Section 31, thence W'y 423.1 ft. on the section line to a point 210 ft. from the S.W. corner of the Section, thence N. 210 ft. parallel with west section line, thence W'y 210 ft. to the point of beginning,

be rezoned "D-M" multiple, subject to platting of the property with plat restrictions limiting development of the area to a maximum of 12 units per acre.

1. The location of this site meets the criteria for apartment development.
2. Apartment development would provide a proper transition between the intersection of two major streets and the interior single family residential.
3. The change would allow the development of land for residential purposes, which could otherwise develop in commercial adjacent to single family residences.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-8-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Manz that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by B. C. Morton to rezone a parcel at 5500 South Cedar Street from "G-2" Wholesale district to "H" Light Industrial district be denied.

The Board believes the previous recommendation for "G-2" Wholesale was reasonable. The Board further believes the

recent residential and potential residential development in this area should be protected against further encroachment of non-residential uses.

This would create a further extension of mixed land uses that most likely would deteriorate into a serious potential of area blight.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-9-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Hugo Tews to rezone a parcel at Northeast corner of Christenson (5000 block) and Jolly Road (1900 block) described as:

Lot 216, Pleasant Grove Subd.

from "A" one family residential to "C" two family district be denied.

The change would be contrary to the established land use plan. The change would create an isolated district, unrelated to similar districts, i.e. this would be a spot zone. There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be developed under the existing zoning.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-10-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Florence Pomroy to rezone a parcel at 114 E. Hillsdale from "D" apartment district to "D-1" professional offices district be denied.

The parcel is small in size, containing a large structure which covers much of the land area. This situation is typical within the block, and has created overcrowding condition.

It would not be possible to provide adequate and accessible off-street parking on the site in accordance with the "D-1" professional district.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-11-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by John A. Tysman to rezone a parcel in the 700 Block of East Miller Road described as:

Commencing at the S.W. corner of Section 3, T3N, R2W, Delhi Township, now City of Lansing. Running E. 222.5 ft., thence N. 387.5 ft. more or less: to a point which is 190 ft. S. of S. line of lot 40 of Sup's plat No. 3. Thence W'ly 222.75 feet parallel with S. line of said lot 40, thence S. 387.5 ft. more or less to point of beginning. The W. 55 ft. being subject to Highway right-of-way. Subject to any and all restrictions and easements of record,

from "A" one family to "F" commercial as filed be denied and the property be rezoned "D-M" multiple dwelling district. The Board believes that this will allow reasonable use of the land and will create a transition between the existing uses.

1. The basic land use conditions have not changed in the area since the previous request was considered.
2. Much of the commercially zoned property south and east of this site is undeveloped, which indicates the market in this area for commercial development does not exist.
3. The change may adversely affect property values in the vicinity and may deter the improvement or development of adjacent properties.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-12-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Manz, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by J. Robert Waters of La-Noble Realty to rezone a parcel at 1209 and 1217 W. Saginaw from "B" one family district to "D-M" multiple district as filed be denied and the property be zoned "C" two family. The Board believes that this will allow density and building development compatible with the surrounding area.

1. "D-M" multiple zoning as defined in the ordinance is contrary to the existing and future land use plan.
2. The present ordinance does not provide for adequate off-street parking.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Manz, Reynolds, and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-13-66

Motion by Bretz seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Homer and Thayer Winegardner to rezone a parcel at 3322 Westmont Avenue described as:

Lot 139 Westmont Subdivision

from "A" one family district to "C" two family district be granted.

The Board further recommends that:

Lots 11 and 12 of Westmont Subd.

to the north of this site be rezoned from "A" one family to "E" apartment shop. This recommendation is in keeping with the zoning policy for North Grand River Avenue.

"C" two family would tend to stabilize the residential area and discourage the commercial development from penetrating further to the south.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Manz, Reynolds, and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-14-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Manz that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Muriel M. Green, Fern Laylin, and Joe D. Pentecost, agent for Hospitality Inns Inc. to rezone a parcel in the 4800 block of Collins Road described as:

Commencing on Section line 1003.1 ft. East of the Southwest corner; thence Northerly along East R.O.W. line of Hwy. I-496 to the Southerly line of Cavanaugh Road connector; thence S. 86° 09' 45" E. 788 ft.; thence S. 44° 52' 49" E. to the West 1/4 line; thence South along the 1/4 line to the South section line; thence West to the P.O.B. except the South 333 ft. of the East 183 ft.; Section 36, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan,

"A" one family district to "F" commercial district be denied.

Sewers and other utilities are not available in the area and have not been in-

cluded in the Capital Improvements Program for the next six years.

The area is proposed for public facilities on the Master Land Use Plan.

The change would be contrary to the land use pattern of the area which is farmland and scattered single family residences.

This change would create an isolated district, not in harmony with surrounding zoning.

"F" commercial zoning allows uses that could be detrimental to the surrounding area.

The amount of land (43) acres requested is considered excessive to the needs for commercial zoning in this low density area.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be used in accordance with the existing zoning.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-15-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Manz that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Stanley Stelmashenko to rezone a parcel at 820 N. Chestnut Street from "C" two family district to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied.

The basic land use conditions have not changed in this area since the last petition for rezoning (March 29, 1965).

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-16-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by H. J. Scherer and J. H. Scherer to rezone a parcel at 2200 South Cedar Street from "C" two family district to "D-M" multiple district and "F" commercial district be denied. "C" two family allows development compatible with the existing residential development to the west.

Any change of zoning at this location either in a commercial nature, or to increase the residential density as proposed would:

1. Adversely affect living conditions in the immediate area, principally through the increase of traffic and activity.
2. Increase traffic congestion at the intersection of Cedar St. and Riley St.
3. Increase the danger to pedestrian traffic which by and large consist of elementary and junior high school students commuting to the nearby school.

The Board believes that the previous recommendation and change of zoning was reasonable.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-17-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Vio Lionetto and Patsy Verderese to rezone a parcel in the 4900 Block S. Pennsylvania Avenue described as:

Lot 28 and com. N.W. cor. Lot 28 thence E. 132 ft., N. 25 ft., W. 132 ft. S. 25 ft. to beg.; Pleasant Ridge Plat. Lot 29 Pleasant Ridge Plat

from "A" one family district to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied.

The change would be contrary to the established land use which is predominately single family residential.

The change would create a spot zone.

Development of the area has not been contrary to the existing regulations.

The Change would adversely affect living conditions in the immediate area principally through the increase of traffic and activity.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot develop under the existing regulations.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-18-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Central Welding Supply Co., Inc. to rezone a parcel at 214 Reasoner St., described as:

The West 39 feet of the North 20 feet of the South 30 feet of Lot 10, and the East 21 feet of the North 20 feet of the South 30 ft. of Lot 8, Block 4, Turner and Smith's Subdivision

from "H" Light Industrial to "I" Heavy industrial district be granted.

The Planning Board further recommends that the previous change under Z-32-64, approved by City Council on July 6, 1964 under number 898 described as:

That a portion of the property being part of Lots 6, 7 and 8, Block 4, Turner and Smith's Subdivision on N.E. ¼ of Section 9, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan described as: Comm. 45 ft. South and 7 ft. East of the N.E. corner of Lot 7, thence West 30 ft., thence South 30 ft., thence East 30 ft. thence North 30 ft. to beginning,

be rezoned from "I" heavy industrial to "H" light industrial.

The entire property was considered by the Planning Board June 4, 1964 for a change from "H" light industrial to "I" heavy industrial. The Planning Board at that time denied the petition as filed, and recommended a portion of the property for heavy industrial.

The City Council concurred in the Planning Board's recommendation and rezoned the property July 6, 1964.

Redevelopment of the land did not take place as planned by the property owners and they are now asking that the location be changed as requested on this petition.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-19-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board inform City Council they made no recommendation on the petition by General Pictures (Duard L. Jones and Charles H. Gass) to rezone a parcel at 5202 and 5208 S. Pennsylvania Avenue from "D-1" to "F" Commercial district. The motion received 5 Affirmative and 1 Negative vote. The requisite number in a rezoning recommendation is six.

The Zoning Committee's recommendation to the Board on this petition was as follows:

That the petition be denied. The requested change could be detrimental to the "A" one family zoning and use to the west. To the south of this area on Pennsylvania

Avenue is vacant "G-2" wholesale and "F" commercial zoned area which could accommodate this type of business.

Mr. Manz advised that this is an island surrounded by commercial and wondered if it could be saved.

Mr. Siebert asked if the Pennway Motel was along here and was advised that it was.

Motion failed by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Reynolds and Siebert—5.

Nays: Manz—1.

STREETS COMMITTEE

ROW-5-66

Motion by Manz, seconded by Black that the Board recommend to City Council that after considering the letter from Camille Abood attorney for Mr. Gary Robinson that the property in the 600 Blk. Banghart St. be made available to the applicant on a year to year basis.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

BUILDINGS AND PROPERTIES

BP-1-66

Motion by Manz, seconded by Black that the Board recommend to the Lansing Board of Education that they build the Edgewood Road—Kahres School north of the Edgewood Road.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

BP-2-66

Motion by Manz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to Mr. Claud R. Erickson, Mechanical Engineer of the Board of Water and Light that after considering his letter of January 25, 1966 regarding the proposed incinerator on the South Landel property in the 3000 block of Alpha Street, that the request be approved subject to State Health Department requirements. The Planning Board further approves the location, character and extent of the proposed incinerator.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

BP-3-66

Motion by Manz, seconded by Black that the Board recommend to City Council that after considering the letter from Carl L. Reagh, Attorney, requesting the city vacate the south 20 ft. of the south 50 ft. drain easement that extends east and west along the north side of the property described as:

Lot 11, Meadow Wood, A subdivision on part the N.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 32, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing (800 Blk. LeGrand)

that the request be denied.

The Board does not believe that this easement will prohibit reasonable develop-

ment of the property, and will in turn, provide for necessary open space between the existing commercial complex and the apartment development that is allowed under the existing zoning.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Motion by Black, seconded by Manz that the balance of the agenda be tabled until the next meeting on Tuesday, March 8th.

Meeting adjourned at 11:51 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

F/F

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Special Meeting, March 8, 1966

Meeting called to order at 7:48 P.M. by
Chairman Russell Fink.

Notice of the meeting had been sent to
the news media.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino,
Reynolds, Siebert—6.

Absent: Houston, Manz—2.

HEARINGS

Z-157-64

Amendment to the Community Unit Plan
for the property located at 3031 S. Wash-
ington Avenue, submitted by Warner Long
Development Co.

Mr. Fink gave an explanation of the re-
quested action at this time.

Mr. Gordon L. Long gave the back-
ground of the action they had taken so
far. This amendment is requested as it
involves the screening of the Heritage
Arms. On the original approval Council
gave them a choice of three types of
screening, but because of the drastic grade
which is on the South side, they must erect
a retaining wall to eliminate the runoff.
This will be done as soon as weather per-
mits. The balance of the area has been
graded. A portion of the gravel is in,
however, it needs black topping. They
have installed a type of cyclone fence with
aluminum stripping. This was not re-
quested in the original letter, but they
would like permission to leave this fence
up. The edge of the black top will tip up
on the ends to keep the water on the lot.
Council instructed a five foot decorative
masonry fence as the southerly barrier and
extending up Washington Avenue suffi-
ciently to screen the parking area on the
south side of the pool. For 100 ft. or more
they are in violation of Council's require-
ments. One of the reasons for the fencing
was the problems of breakage, theft, etc.
They were mostly concerned with getting
the fence up to eliminate the problem, and
felt that this type of screening would give
best privacy for all concerned. They have
snow fences on Washington Avenue. After

the fence was installed they were told
that it was in violation. His neighbor to the
South is concerned. They propose that
they be allowed, instead of placing a ma-
sonry fence, to leave the fence already
erected so that it will prevent anyone step-
ping on the neighbor's property. The fence
on Washington Avenue is to be eliminated
and will be replaced with green area.

He further advised that State laws cover
the screening for the pool area.

There was a pocket in the area, this will
be brought up to grade and a drain has
been installed to eliminate the water prob-
lem.

Mr. Reynolds asked if the present screen-
ing would be agreeable to the neighbors.

Mr. Paul Younger representing Mr.
Arthur Cranmor, owner of the property
directly to the south of the project, ap-
peared and stated that they questioned the
divergence from the plans accepted by the
city. This is a residential area with a
variety of houses. The people agreed to
this Community Unit Plan on the basis
of a masonry decorative wall. As far as
the cyclone fence to keep the kids out, they
can get under the fence in a number of
places. The fence was built at night. The
aluminum strips come out and it rattles.
The area should be enhanced with a nice
looking wall around it. This is a nice neigh-
borhood and they want to keep it that
way. The southside will get a lot of mud
before the retaining wall is built. The
north side may get some too. He stated
that he believes that the fence on Wash-
ington is a safety hazard to both pedes-
trians and traffic, particularly at night.
He presented pictures of the fence as it is
now.

Mr. Cranmor then advised that the fence
is four feet from his house. His bedroom
is on that side.

Mr. Bob Belon, 610 W. Hodge is the
fourth house north on Washington and his
property abuts the fence on the south side.
He advised that he had talked to Mr. War-
ner about the fence with the retaining wall
and the masonry fence. Now there is this
cyclone fence which has three inch holes
with 1½ inch rails. Usually required are
two inch rails. There is a three foot drop

from his lot into theirs. A medium wind makes the fence rattle. He stated that he thought it is detrimental to the neighborhood.

Mr. John Pratt, 538 Hodge lives on the south side questioned the fence and why it was put up at night. They have the fence in two pieces. There is an opening of three or four feet between. There is about 18 inches open underneath so that the kids can get in. They filled in his yard some and then when the last snow storm came he was troubled by flooding.

Mr. Thomas Hall, 530 Hodge wondered how they can put a retaining wall on their property.

Mr. Bill Wilkins, 600 W. Hodges reported that when they were grading the property they got the equipment too close and hit his house, tearing up roofing. The fence is only some five inches from the edge of his roof. The noise creates a problem. When they were putting the fence up the workmen were walking on his roof. The fence does not look nice and they have not contacted him on compensation for the damage. Snow and water wash down into his yard. He had no flooding problems before the grading as the slant went the other way.

Mr. Black stated that he was confused if the fence was only four inches from his house, and was informed that the house is sitting on the far back of the property.

Mr. Long then stated that the damage to the property will be taken care of by the contractor. They have no intention of surveying the property. They will put the retaining wall on the property line and the wall will be 100 per cent on their property.

Mr. Black then asked when the retaining wall is finished, will all sides be higher than their neighbors, and was advised that it would be on one side. The drain has been places on the lowest spot in the area and there should be no other low spots. Mr. Long stated that he will agree with Mr. Cranmor on the front fence and will do as the Board suggests but would like to have something there.

Mr. Fink asked where the swimming pool would be in relation to Mr. Cranmor's property and was advised that it would be 60 to 70 feet north of the property line.

Mr. Younger stated that he had checked with the Building Inspector and the specifications for the wall to be around the perimeter two feet six inches to three feet six inches. He recommended that all the provisions except the provision near Cranmor's house remain the same.

Mr. Long remarked that he will contact Sears relative to the elimination of the noise of the fence.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Revision of Sections 36-25, 36-28, 36-46, and 36-47 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Edwin P. Brown read the proposed ordinance.

Mr. Black suggested that the board take into consideration the data presented regarding other cities in Michigan. Lansing's density is much higher than other cities. Theoretically in the DM, Ann Arbor has 29, Benton Harbor 21, Pontiac 24, Saginaw 34 and Lansing 43. In the "D" High Rise, Lansing has 86 units per acre while Ann Arbor has 43, Benton Harbor 43, Grand Rapids 44, and Saginaw 60.

Mr. Harold Davis reported to the Board that he handles commercial, industrial and investment properties, and thinks that in this particular case the esthetic must find a common meeting current with practical things. It is an error to apply a proposed amendment to the city as a whole.

The cost of providing the land for these various buildings is not uniform throughout the city. Assuming the cost is \$300 per square foot on 1500 square feet, the land would cost \$4,500 for apartment in addition to two parking spaces of 600 square feet for an \$1800 more. The total would be \$6,300 to provide land for one "D-M" apartment unit, this is ignoring setbacks, etc. He stated he didn't think that the ordinance in the "D" apartment classification should be uniform in all parts of the city. Those persons who desire to move into the core of the city do so for the advantages that the core provides for them. They are not interested in flowers and grass. Masonry can be just as beautiful. Those who are willing to move out where the land is beautiful and land costs per unit are substantially lower do so because they want more air, space and amenities that the subdivision area can provide for them. Those who want to live in the core area are willing to sacrifice many things for the convenience that the area will provide. He respectfully requested that the staff furnish a breakdown of certain areas within the city.

Mrs. Bretz asked why other cities around Lansing have higher land requirements and Mr. Davis answered that land cost is lower.

Mr. Fink gave an explanation of the Community Unit Plan and its intention and the potential blighted areas where there is overcrowding of land on some newer apartment and multiple structures.

Mr. Davis then reminded the board that the core of the city should warrant special attention and be something that we should be proud of.

Matter was referred to the Ordinance Committee.

Mr. T. Michael Doyle submitted a petition with regard to the mobile home de-

velopment in Lansing, and stated that he would like to commend the board and the staff on the research in development of this proposed ordinance. He further quoted that their survey as presented to the board and covered with red dots, was circulated in two days.

Mr. Adolph Frantz asked if the ordinance on mobile homes would be presented to City Council tonight and was informed by Mr. Black that the committee had a recommendation to present to the Board for adoption.

Recess was from 9:17 to 9:53 P.M.

BUSINESS SESSION

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Reynolds that the Planning Board minutes of January 18 and February 15 be approved.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-199-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the zoning petition be moved from the table.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommended to City Council that the petition by Karl Kessler to rezone a parcel in the 1400-1500 block of Marquette Street described as:

Commencing northwest corner Lot 168, M. Mitshkun's Oak Grove Subd. No. 2, thence southwesterly to southwest corner Lot 168, northwesterly along northerly line Marquette Ave. 250 ft., northeasterly 200 ft. to southerly line C & O R.R. R/W, southeasterly 250 ft. to beginning, Section 5, T4N, R2W,

from "A" one family to Community Unit Plan be approved subject to the following:

1. That six parking spaces be eliminated and that the parking be rearranged as indicated on the site plan.
2. Screening of one of the following to be provided along the southeast property line:
 - a. Three of four ft. high cyclone type fence with dense evergreen plantings of a mature minimum height of six feet.
 - b. A six ft. high cyclone type fence with interwoven slats, or

c. A six ft. high minimum decorative masonry wall.

3. Screening consisting of dense evergreen plantings of a minimum mature height of four feet to be provided along the southwest property line.
4. Occupancy permit is to be issued only after the foregoing conditions have been met.
5. Construction to begin no later than one year from date of Council approval and building permit to be issued no later than six months from date of Council approval.

Following a period of study by the Planning Staff and a public hearing held on March 8, 1966 it was found that:

1. The adjacent property would not be adversely affected.
2. The plan is consistent with the intent and purpose of the zoning code to promote public health, safety, morals and general welfare.
3. The buildings and structures shall be used only for community activity.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Reynolds, Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-2-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the zoning petition be moved from the table.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the board recommend to City Council that the petition by L. E. and E. L. Belen to rezone a parcel at 622 and 626 W. Kalamazoo from "D" apartment-shop district to "E" apartment-shop district be granted because of long standing historical use.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

STREETS COMMITTEE

S-2-66 Assessors Plats

Motion by Reynolds seconded by Bretz that a Public Hearing be set for 7:30 P.M.

on Tuesday, April 5, 1966 at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1 of City Hall.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

ROW-1-66

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Black that the Board recommend to City Council that after considering the letter from John W. Tracy relative to deeding a 66 foot strip of alley at 316 and 318 East Michigan Avenue to the city, that this offer be declined.

The 66 x 18 foot alley is part of a longer alley which has never been dedicated to the city. The acceptance by the city of this portion of an alley would give the city an isolated parcel of land surrounded on all sides by private ownerships.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Reynolds, Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

ROW-2-66

Motion by Reynolds seconded by Black that the David Street right-of-way requested by Motor Wheel Corporation to be vacated,

from a point 148 feet east of the centerline of North East Street, easterly to the right-of-way of the New York Central railroad

be retained by the city as it is needed for the future east-west development of a connector to serve this area.

Mr. Fink mentioned that there might be other alternatives than the extension of David Street. Further discussion on the alternatives followed.

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Black that the matter be tabled to the next meeting.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

ROW-4-66

Motion by Reynolds seconded by Black that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition to vacate Risdale Street from the west ROW-line of Richmond Street to a point approximately 305 feet east of the ROW line of Ingham Street be granted subject to the retention of public easements as may be required by the Board of Public Service.

Mr. Fink advised that a condition of the 221 d 3 before approval was the vacation

and the realignment. Mr. Black further explained that the proposed realignment is not on the petitioner's property.

Mr. Black then withdrew his second until the new alignment is firmed up.

Mr. Reynolds then withdrew the motion.

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Black that the matter be tabled until the realignment situation is clarified.

Motion carried by unanimous vote:

ROW-5-66

Motion by Reynolds seconded by Heino that the Board reconsider its previous action on the application to lease a portion of Banghart Street lying west of North East Street.

Mr. James Church, Senior Planner, advised the Board that the City Attorney had given an opinion that the City could not lease a public right-of-way.

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Siebert that the right-of-way be retained by the City.

Mr. Black then stated that he thought that the petitioner could use this property for something until it were needed for street purposes, and proposed that the Board recommend to Council that they try to set up a means where the property might be used by the petitioner.

Mr. Fink then queried as to whether or not Harris and Banghart might both be considered potential entrances to Gier Park.

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Black that the matter be tabled for further information.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

ROW-8-66

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Black that the Board recommend to Mr. M. Tarik Ataman, Assistant Director of the Department of State Highways that after examining the extent, character and location thereof,

The State Highway Department pursue the widening of Oakland Avenue between Grand River Avenue and Ballard Street on the North side.

They include in the original construction contract a provision for plantings to replace trees which will be lost during construction.

They examine carefully and adjust the vertical alignment of Oakland Street where

it crosses Pennsylvania Avenue as this intersection is at present quite dangerous, having been the scene of thirty-five accidents in 1965 and two fatalities in the past three years.

Mr. Siebert asked why they requested a recommendation only west as far as Ballard Street. Mr. Rizzuti informed the Board that the houses are gone on that side, so perhaps the state has already acquired this area.

Mr. Black advised that he agreed with Mr. Rizzuti's thinking.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Reynolds, Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. Reynolds mentioned the status of the mall construction design. Their Board has interviewed four consultants and their committee will recommend at the next meeting.

Mr. Fink mentioned mall transportation considerations should be also included. Mr. Reynolds enumerated other problems that the mall consultant will be required to do.

Motion by Reynolds seconded by Bretz that the policy and procedure of the Board be suspended so that a recommendation might be forwarded to City Council without a staff recommendation, unless there is a negative approach to this by the staff.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Bretz that the following letter be sent to Council:

(On file in the Planning Department)

Mr. Black then stated that moving the ramp to the West should be stressed in that it will make it impossible to get on Grand Avenue without adding another land. Barton the consultant stated when Washington Avenue closed to become a mall, Grand Avenue is to be increased by two lanes. If the turn out lane to go into ramp is moved six feet West, the turn out lane disappears and any possibility of additional traffic lanes will also disappear. This is a serious problem.

Mr. Reynolds stated that staff would go over his recommendation adding their comments and also those of Mr. Black.

Mr. Black stated that unless we now protest about the looks of the building, that they will start re-designing and engineering. This could be avoided.

Mr. Fink stated that he was concerned about the traffic movement, ingress and egress approaches to the ramp, an overpass or underpass. He further recommended that a traffic review of the downtown should be considered. Perhaps a pool of information of other departments on their thinking on the problems involved.

Mr. Black stated that he agreed with this 100% and asked why do we stand here? Our only approach is by resolution, concept, etc. Will we get a chance to review again

Mr. Fink then stated that if new plans are submitted the Board should have them to review.

Mr. Reynolds stated that the desire of intent of the letter was as stated.

Mr. Fink further stated that the Board should list all their recommendations in this letter inasmuch as time is not a factor now.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—5.

Nays: Fink—1.

ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

Yard Definitions: Motion by Black, seconded by Bretz that the Board recommend to City Council that the following amendment to the Zoning Ordinance be adopted:

Section 36-1 Definitions

- (45) **Front Yard:** Is an open space the full width of the lot, the depth of which is the minimum horizontal distance between the front lot line and the nearest point of the main building.
- (46) **Rear Yard:** Is an open space extending the full width of the lot the depth of which is the minimum horizontal distance between the rear lot line and the nearest point of the main building. In the case of a corner lot, the rear yard may be opposite either street frontage.
- (47) **Side Yard:** Is an open space between a main building and the side lot line, extending from the front yard to the rear yard, the width of which is the horizontal distance from the nearest point on the side lot line to the nearest point of the main building.

On February 22, 1966, the Planning Board held a public hearing as required by Act 207, Public Acts of 1921. No one appeared to support or contest the amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Reynolds, Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Mobile Home Parks: Motion by Black, seconded by Bretz that the Board recommend to City Council that the following Mobile Home Ordinance be adopted:

Section: 36-22.1 Same—Mobile Home Developments.

No person shall use or permit the use of any mobile home as a residence on any site, lot, field, or tract of land contrary to the provisions of this section; provided, that this section shall not prohibit "trailer or tourist camps" as defined in Section 36-1 (43) otherwise permitted by this Chapter.

In any "C" two family, "D-M" multiple dwelling or "D" apartment district the following use shall be permitted (and expressly prohibited in all other districts) subject to the conditions hereinafter imposed and subject further to the review and approval, after a legal public hearing, of a site plan by the Planning Board and subsequent issuance of a building and occupancy permit by the Building Division of the Public Service Department. However, Mobile Home Developments and incidental facilities shall be subject to the following conditions:

Council may modify or reject any condition of approval, recommended by the Planning Board by a two-thirds vote of its membership.

Section 1.

(a) Ten per cent of the circumference of the development shall abut an industrial Zone, "H" or "I". There shall be a minimum of fifty sites in a development. Not more than one mobile home shall be located on a site. Mobile home developments shall also be permitted in the "H" light industrial district, provided it is not surrounded on more than three sides by the "H" district and provided further that the zoning district adjacent to the "H" is "C" two family, "D-M" multiple family, "D" apartment district or "F" commercial district.

(b) A complete copy of the plans and specifications filed as required under Section 7 and Section 8 of the "trailer coach park act of 1959," and any alteration of plans required under said act, shall be filed with the City Clerk.

(c) Utility installations and connections shall be done in accordance with plans approved by the appropriate city agencies. Sewer, water, electricity, telephone, and fuel installations shall be placed underground and located in a uniform manner.

The entire edvelopment shall be lighted so as to provide an average of 2/10 lumens of light per square foot over the entire development.

(d) Only those mobile homes that require a state highway permit under the Michigan Motor Vehicle Code for travel shall be allowed in a site.

(e) Private streets shall be paved to a minimum width as follows:

| | Traffic Use | Min Width |
|--|----------------|--------------|
| 1. No parking on road | 2-way road | 24 ft. |
| (Separate lot or on-site parking provided) | | |
| 2. Parallel parking, | 1-way road | 20 ft. |
| 1 side only | | |
| 3. Parallel parking, | 1-way road | 28 ft. |
| 2 sides | | |
| 4. Parallel parking, | 2-way road | 40 ft. |
| 2 sides | | |

In addition, there shall be a curb and a three foot sidewalk which may be contiguous to or part of the curb.

(f) Parking shall be provided on a basis of two spaces per unit. At least one space shall be provided on each site. To provide the balance of the requirement, group parking may be utilized provided it is within three hundred (300) feet of all sites it is intended to serve. All parking areas shall be clearly defined and hard-surfaced.

(g) Wherever a development intersects a stub of a public street or wherever required as part of a comprehensive street pattern a dedication or continuance of the street may be required upon recommendation by the Planning Board.

(h) The average site size shall be at least three thousand five hundred (3500) square feet except that the minimum site shall not be less than three thousand (3000) square feet. Each site shall front on a paved street. Each site development shall front on a paved public thoroughfare and have its principal access thereto, which access shall also be paved.

(i) There shall be unobstructed open spaces between each two (2) mobile homes of not less than fifteen (15) feet in any direction.

(j) No mobile home shall be closer than twenty five (25) feet to any public right-of-way or closer than fifteen (15) feet to the curb line of any private street or the perimeter of the site.

(k) All mobile homes shall be parked on a reinforced concrete slab, said slab to be at least four (4) inches in depth and have a minimum area not less than ten (10) feet in width or fifty (50) feet in length. The Building Inspector may alter the require-

ments of the area of the slab based upon the irregular design of the mobile home or may alter the requirement of thickness based on soil conditions.

(i) Skirts of an approved and incombustible material may be required around each mobile home upon recommendation from the Planning Board.

(m) Fences and/or greenbelts may be required when recommended by the Planning Board. At least ten (10) per cent of the development shall consist of greenbelts and open recreation areas. This is exclusive of the thirty-five (3500) hundred square feet average site.

(n) Accessory buildings required for normal operation of the mobile home development shall be permitted subject to the height restrictions of the "C" two family district and applicable codes and ordinances. Convenience buildings and/or uses of a commercial nature including stores, mechanical dispensers, coin operated laundry and dry cleaning agencies, and beauty shops, may be permitted on recommendation of the Planning Board, subject to the following restrictions:

1. Such use, including the related parking shall not occupy more than ten (10) per cent of the total site.
2. All such uses shall be subordinate to the residential use and character of the park.
3. Shall be located, designed and intended to serve frequent trade or service needs of persons residing in the park.
4. Shall present no visible evidence of their commercial character from any residential district outside the park.

(o) Mobile home placement and mobile home developments shall comply with all applicable codes, ordinances and statutes.

(p) In the process of reviewing site plans the Planning Board shall consider:

1. The location and design of driveways providing vehicular ingress to and egress from the lot, in relation to streets giving access to the site, and in relation to pedestrian traffic.
2. The traffic circulation features within the site and location of automobile parking areas; and may make such requirement with respect to any matters as will assure:

- A. Safety and convenience of both vehicular and pedestrian traffic both within the site and in relation to access streets.

B. Satisfactory and harmonious relations between the development on the site and the existing and prospective development of contiguous land and adjacent neighborhoods.

3. Whether the site will be served adequately by essential public facilities and services, such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, drainage structures, refuse disposals, utilities and schools.
4. Whether the site will not create excessive additional requirements at public cost for public facilities and services.
5. Whether the site will be consistent with the intent and purpose of this chapter.
6. Whether the site will be an improvement or detriment to property in the immediate vicinity.
7. And may require landscaping, fences, and walls in pursuance of these objectives and same shall be provided and maintained as a condition of the establishment and the continued maintenance of any use to which they are appurtenant.

(q) Any building or land lawfully occupied or used at the date on which this section becomes effective, which occupation or use does not conform with the provisions and requirements of this section, shall constitute a nonconforming use.

Section 2. All ordinances or parts of ordinances inconsistent with the provisions hereof are hereby repealed.

The draft of this amendment is a refinement of the draft submitted by City Council to the Planning Board for public hearing. Reviews, including staff research, committee meetings, and the public hearing on February 22, 1966 resulted in the changes as indicated.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Reynolds, Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Notification of the M.S.U. Seminar to be held in mid month was read to the board.

Meeting adjourned at 12:20 A.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

F/P

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE AIR POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, April 26, 1966

The regular meeting of the Air Pollution Board was held Tuesday evening, April 26, 1966, at 7:30 p.m. in Room 136, City Hall.

Present: Board Members Ansley, Bintz, Dodson, Oeming, Ruth and Ray—6.

Absent: Board Members Kloeckner and Tableman—2.

The meeting was called to order by Vice-Chairman Oeming. The secretary announced that a quorum was present. It was moved by Mr. Ansley, seconded by Mr. Ruth, that the minutes of the March meeting be approved as printed.

Motion carried.

There was a discussion of the problem caused by the Everett Elementary School playground. Mr. Ansley indicated that nothing has been done as yet. It was moved by Mr. Ansley, seconded by Mr. Dodson, that a letter be sent to Mr. Walker, Assistant Superintendent, Business and Physical Plant, requesting information as to their treatment schedule.

Motion carried.

There has been no further communication from the City Attorney regarding Capital Laundry.

The next meeting will be held Tuesday evening May 31, 1966, at 7:30 p.m., in Room 136, City Hall.

It was moved by Mr. Bintz, seconded by Mr. Dodson, that the meeting be adjourned.

Motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

LORING F. OEMING,
Vice-Chairman,

NORMA DONOVAN,
Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Special Meeting, March 22, 1966

Meeting was called to order at 7:46 P.M. by Chairman Russell Fink.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Absent: Black—1.

BUSINESS SESSION

Motion by Siebert, second by Bretz, that the minutes of February 22nd be approved as read.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-121-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the amendment to the Community Unit Plan a 3416 Stabler and 105 W. Holmes Road submitted by Herman Davidson asking to allow the exclusion of the four southern apartment buildings, as approved by City Council on October 18, 1965, be granted.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-157-64

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the amendment to the Community Unit Plan for property located at 3031 S. Washington Avenue submitted by Warner and Long Development Corporation be denied as filed and further recommends that the developer construct a retaining wall along portions of the southern property line as may be required to retain grade fill from the parking area, and to keep water and dirt from washing onto the abutting properties. The existing fence along the southern property line is to be an integral part of the retaining wall by reconstructing the fence with the posts anchored into such retaining wall.

The Board should further recommend that a 3½ foot high decorative masonry wall be constructed along the southern property line of the swimming pool parking area, beginning at a point 25 feet from the east ROW line of Washington Avenue, and extending easterly approximately 85 feet. The wall is to replace the existing cyclone type fence. In addition, that portion of the existing fence on the northern property line which lies within 49.5 feet of the east ROW line of Washington Avenue is to be removed. Also the two southwesterly parking spaces in the swimming pool area to be eliminated.

Mr. Paul Younger was allowed to speak.

Mr. Younger then stated that he didn't believe Mr. Cranmer would agree with the recommendation. The wall would be OK, they should remove the rattle of the fence, but the overall factor of leaving the fence there would be damaging to his property and everybody else's in this area. Mr. Cranmer is getting some benefit from it, but the overall factor is not good. He further stated that he can't understand why they can't comply with what they were asked to do. He remarked that he feels this is important to the people who have their savings in the property around there.

These people who own land around agreed to their plan on one basis—that they put up a respectable fence. He stated he feels that they should carry out the original approval of council. A decorative fence will improve the value of their property. This is not a hardship on the developer.

Mr. Bob Belon, 610 W. Hodge, advised the Board that his main complaint was the rattling of the fence. The developer advised that he was putting up the cyclone fence as a temporary fence, now they want to leave it up permanently.

Mr. Fink explained that the rattling will be eliminated—that was assured by the company installing the fence. The Zoning Committee had driven around the project several times and he mentioned other possible objectional types of fencing in the area and they thought this might be an improvement to the area. The committee spent over two hours looking over the property and making a review of same.

Mr. Manz asked why the Board should relent on the requirements in allowing them to leave the cyclone type of fence. There were no objections to the masonry wall on the western line.

Some discussion followed with explanations of the requirements as proposed.

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino that the motion be amended as follows:

"That the developers would be required to have the fence tightened to the satisfaction of the people in the neighborhood."

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Abstain: Gaus—1.

The vote on the overall question with the amendment failed to pass by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Heino and Siebert—4.

Nays: Manz, Reynolds—2.

Abstain: Gaus—1.

TRZ-1-66

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Bretz that a public hearing be held on the property on the South side of Jolly Road between Pennsylvania and the New York Central Right-of-way on Tuesday, April 19, 1966 at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

TRZ-2-66

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Bretz that a public hearing be held for property located in the 4100 and 4200 block of North Grand River Avenue on Tuesday, April 19, 1966 at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1.

TRZ-3-66

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Bretz that a public hearing be held for property located in the 3300 block North Logan Street on Tuesday, April 19, 1966 at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

TRZ-4-66

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Bretz that a public hearing be held for property located South of Armstrong Road between Cedar and Pennsylvania Avenue on Tuesday, April 19, 1966 at 7:30 P.M. Court Room No. 1.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

STREETS COMMITTEE

ROW-2-66

Motion by Manz, seconded by Reynolds that the Board recommend to City Council that after considering the letter from Motor Wheel Corporation requesting a portion of David Street be vacated, i.e. north and south sides from a point 148 feet east of center line of North East Street easterly to right-of-way of NYCRR, that the David Street right-of-way be retained as it is needed for the future east-west development of a connector to serve this area of the city.

The Board further recommends that negotiations and discussions, which are currently under way, relative to the right-of-ways needed and exact alignment, be carried out with Motor Wheel and other interested parties.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

ROW-4-66

Motion by Manz, seconded by Reynolds that the Board recommend to City Council that after considering the request of Mr. Francis Fine that Risdale Street in Sunny Ridge Subdivision, West of Richmond Street by vacated, that the request be granted subject to:

1. A replat and dedication of the relocation route of Risdale Street within

Sunny Ridge Subdivision described as follows:

Commencing at the intersection of the east line of Ingham Street and the north line of Risdale Street, said point being the point of curvature of a curve (Curve No. 1) to the southeast with a radius of 470.89 feet and tangent to the north line of Risdale Street, thence southeasterly along said Curve No. 1 to the point of beginning 10 feet east of the N.W. corner of Lot 19 of Sunny Ridge Subdivision, thence continuing along said Curve No. 1 to the east line of said Lot 19, thence south $0^{\circ} 81' E.$ to the intersection with a curve (Curve No. 2) parallel to and sixty feet south of said Curve No. 1, thence northwesterly along said Curve No. 2 to the northwest corner of Lot 22 of Sunny Ridge Subdivision, thence east 230 feet to the point of beginning.

2. The retention of utility easements as may be required by the Board of Public Service.

This will, in effect, create a stub street within Sunny Ridge Subdivision to serve the Community Unit Plan and will be available for future development of the property immediately east of the stub street and south of the Community Unit Plan.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

ROW-5-66

Motion by Manz, seconded by Reynolds that the Board recommend to City Council that after considering the letter from Camille Abood, Attorney for Mr. Gary Robinson requesting the sale or lease of a portion of property in the 600 block Banghart Street, that the city not sell or vacate any portion of Banghart Street.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

SM-1-66

Motion by Manz, seconded by Reynolds that the Board approve the minor subdivision requested for property located at 4433 and 4525 North Grand River Avenue be approved as filed.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Heino, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

SM-2-66

Motion by Manz, seconded by Reynolds that the Board notify City Council that they approved the request for a minor subdivision involving Lots 115 and 116 of Jessop's Home Gardens Subdivision and recommends that it be approved by City Council subject to:

The provision of utility easements along the west property line of Parcel A, and the rear lot lines of Parcel B & C as may be required by the Board of Water and Light.

The minor subdivision consists of three lots having frontage on two dedicated and improved public streets with all public utilities.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Heino, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

SM-3-66

Motion by Manz, seconded by Reynolds that the Board direct the Planning Director to sign the minor subdivision for property in the 6000 block of Daft Street, as such time as it may be cleared by the staff, and if the staff finds any discrepancies it will return the plat to the Board for final decision.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Heino, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. Reynolds reported that the Redevelopment Board had accepted the resubmission on Lot No. 1. They have had inquiries but no others have offered proposals.

The Director discussed the happenings in court in regard to the injunction, appeals and of the hearing dates.

Recess was from 8:55 to 9:07 P.M. During this period Mr. Brown explained the Housing Committee meeting held today.

ORDINANCE

Revision of Section 36-47 "D" Districts: Motion by Siebert, seconded by Bretz that the Board recommend to City Council that Sub-section be amended to read as follows:

In the "D" apartment districts the height of buildings, the minimum dimensions of

yards, and the minimum lot areas per family shall be as follows:

1. **Height.** In a "D" apartment district no building hereafter erected or structurally altered shall exceed ninety feet, except for elevator penthouses and other similar mechanical or electrical equipment which may extend above this ninety-foot limit, but shall not be within fifteen feet of any street side of the building, and except further, as provided in section 36-54 hereof.
2. **Rear Yard.** There shall be a rear yard having a depth of not less than twenty-five feet for interior lots nor less than fifteen feet for corner lots, except as provided in section 36-54 hereof.
3. **Side Yard.** On interior lots and for buildings not exceeding two and one-half stories in height the side yard shall be a minimum of 10 ft. on each side of the building. On corner lots, where only one side yard occurs, the minimum side yard shall be 10 ft. Where buildings exceed two and one-half stories, a minimum of 10 ft. shall be required for side yards.
4. **Front Yard.** There shall be a front yard having a depth of not less than twenty feet to the front line of the building, and not less than twelve feet to the front line of any open porch or paved terrace; provided, however, where a lot is located at the intersection of two or more streets, there shall be a front yard on each street side of a corner lot, except that the buildable width of such lot shall not be reduced to less than twenty-five feet. No accessory building shall project beyond the front yard line on either street.

Where lots comprising forty per cent or more of the frontage, between intersecting streets, are developed with buildings having an average front yard with a variation in depth of not more than six feet, no building hereafter erected or structurally altered shall project beyond the average front yard line so established, provided, further, this regulation shall not be so interpreted as to require a front yard of more than fifty feet.

5. **Lot area per family.** The lot area requirements for one and two-family dwellings shall be the same as in a "C" two-family district.

In a "D" apartment district every building hereafter erected or structurally altered for multiple-dwelling purposes shall provide a lot area of not less than nine hundred (900) square feet per family. Lot area regulations of a "C" two-family district shall apply to one and two-family dwellings erected in a "D" apartment district.

Provided, however, where a lot has less area than herein required and was

of record at the time of the passage of ordinance number 154, such lot may be used for a single-family dwelling and the usual accessory buildings.

Section 2. All ordinances or parts of ordinances inconsistent with the provisions hereof are hereby repealed.

Mr. Reynolds asked the number of feet of floor area per person and was advised that this was covered in the Housing Code. Mr. Reynolds then asked if there would be any difference if this were next to a park and was advised that there would be none. He then asked about the Central City density and was advised that it would be covered in the new ordinance.

Mrs. Bretz advised that she would prefer two parking spaces per unit.

Mr. Siebert advised that for students at MSU it was suggested that 4 parking spaces per apartment be allowed particularly where there are four male students living in an apartment.

Mr. Fink stated that he would like to have more green space.

Mr. Reynolds remarked that some state employees would not need cars as much as others who would have farther to go to work.

Mrs. Bretz wondered what would happen if we asked for a survey of state employees.

Mr. Siebert stated he felt one and one-half cars would be a pretty good shot at finding out whether or not this would be adequate.

Mr. Manz remarked that until further knowledge is obtained this might be a good place to start from.

Mr. Heino reported that the Bureau of Census—Mr. Languis' office—has a copy of a survey of state employees.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Revision to Section 36-28 Parking. Motion by Siebert, seconded by Bretz that the Board recommend to City Council that the Code of Ordinances be amended to read:

Section 36-28. Same—Parking area.

Whenever a structure is erected, converted or structurally altered for multiple-dwelling purposes in any "D" apartment district, there shall be provided accessible parking space on the lot, either garage or surfaced area, adequate to accommodate one and one-half cars for each dwelling unit provided in the structure.

Section 2. All ordinances or parts of ordinances inconsistent with the provisions hereof are hereby repealed.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Revision to Section 36-46 "D-M" multiple dwelling district. Motion by Siebert, seconded by Bretz that the Board recommend to City Council that Sub-section 5 of the Code of Ordinances be amended to read as follows:

Section 36-46. "D-M" districts.

In the "D-M" multiple dwelling districts the heights of buildings, the minimum dimensions of yards, and the minimum lot area per family shall be as follows:

1. **Height.** In a "D-M" multiple-dwelling district to building hereafter erected or structurally altered shall exceed three stories, or forty-five feet, except as provided in section 36-54 hereof.
2. **Rear Yard.** There shall be a rear yard having a depth of not less than twenty-five feet for interior lots nor less than fifteen feet for corner lots, except as provided in section 36-54 hereof.
3. **Side Yard.** On interior lots and for buildings not exceeding two and one-half stories in height the side yard shall be a minimum of 10 ft. on each side of the building. On corner lots, where only one side yard occurs, the minimum side yard shall be 10 ft. Where buildings exceed two and one-half stories, a minimum of 10 ft. shall be required for side yards.
4. **Front Yards.** There shall be a front yard a depth of not less than twenty feet to the front line of the building, and not less than twelve feet to the front line of any porch or paved terrace; provided, however, where a lot is located at the intersection of two or more streets, there shall be a front yard on each street side of a corner lot, except that the building width of such lot shall not be reduced to less than twenty-five feet. No accessory building shall project beyond the front yard line on either street.

Where lots comprising forty per cent or more of the frontage, between intersecting streets, are developed with buildings having an average front yard with a variation in depth of not more than six feet, no building hereafter erected or structurally altered shall project beyond the average front yard line so established, provided, further, this regulation shall not be so interpreted as to require a front yard of more than fifty feet.

5. **Lot area per family.** In the "D-M" multiple dwelling district every building hereafter erected or structurally altered for multiple-dwelling purposes shall provide a lot area of not less than five thousand (5,000) square feet for the first family and one thousand five hundred (1,500) square feet for each family thereafter.

Provided, however, where a lot has less area than herein required and was of record at the time of the passage of ordinance number 154, such lot may be used for a single-family dwelling and the usual accessory buildings.

Section 2. All ordinances or parts of ordinances inconsistent with the provisions hereof are hereby repealed.

Mr. Manz asked for a clarification on the ten foot side yard and was advised that this would require a ten foot side yard regardless of the height of the building. Under the present ordinance the side yard is decreased on the height of the building.

Mr. Fink asked if the unused parking area could be retained for green area and was informed that this would be very hard to enforce.

Mr. Siebert then called the Board's attention to the fact that two such area abutting would give 50 feet of green area.

Mrs. Bretz remarked that the developer will not black top unless told to do so.

Mr. Reynolds asked the reason for the two car requirement in this area rather than the one and one-half cars as required in the "D".

Mr. Fink replied that these will be further from the downtown area.

The Secretary then informed the Board that the "D-M" zoning is usually in the fringe area.

Mr. Siebert then explained that the "D" downtown will allow the developer better use of their land cost. There are very few 90 ft. apartment areas outside of the downtown area.

Mr. Manz then stated that the present ordinance doesn't specify what type of surfacing would be required.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Heino, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Revision to Section 36-25 Parking. Motion by Siebert, seconded by Bretz, that the Board recommend to City Council that Section 36-25 of the Code of Ordinances be amended to read as follows:

Section 36-25. Same—Parking area.

Whenever a structure is erected, converted or structurally altered for multiple-dwelling purposes in any "D-M" multiple-dwelling district, there shall be provided accessible parking space on the lot, either garage or surfaced area, adequate to accommodate two cars for each dwelling unit provided in the structure.

Section 2. All ordinances or parts of ordinances inconsistent with the provisions hereof are hereby repealed.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Heino, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Addition to Section 36-39 of the Zoning Ordinance. Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that a Public Hearing be held by the Planning Board on the revision of the "H" light industrial district to reduce the possibility of mixed uses on Tuesday, April 19, 1966, 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1 on the Sixth Floor of City Hall.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Revision of Section 36-53 of the Zoning Ordinance. Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that a Public Hearing be held by the Planning Board on the revision of the "H" light industrial and "I" heavy industrial district which would disallow apartment buildings on Tuesday, April 19, 1966 at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1 Sixth Floor of City Hall.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

"D" Apartment and "D-M" Multiple Density Changes. Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that they allow a _____ period from time of enactment to time of enforcement. This will grant developers time to initiate plans on development which may be in some stage of promotion or completion.

Mr. Brown explained that the effective date should be perhaps 30 to 60 days.

Mr. Reynolds questioned whether a 6 month's delay in effective date would suffice and the general consensus was that this would be too long.

Mr. Fink remarked that he thought it was superfluous.

Further discussion followed.

Motion failed by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—4.

Nays: Fink, Heino, Gaus—3.

Mrs. Bretz left at 10:07 P.M.

FINANCE

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that \$200 be transferred from the 170110 Salaries account to a special account to help defray the cost of moving and storage expenses incurred by Mr. Robert L. Rizzuti in his move from Denver, Colorado to Lansing.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Fink, Manz, Heino, Gaus, Reynolds, Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The brochure mentioning the Ohio Planning Conference on March 21st was read.

The Secretary read a portion of a clipping from the Toledo paper regarding some comments by Dr. Constantinos Doxiadis.

On the Subdivision transfers, it was suggested that the staff be authorized with a form of policy statement to give approval of such transfers when they are made. If there are any discrepancies, they would be brought before the Board. Administratively this would cut down on the work load of the Board.

Mr. Manz asked if this would be in agreement with the State Plat Act, and was advised that Act 285 contained the authorization and responsibility and there would be no variation on the existing streets.

Motion by Manz, seconded by Reynolds that the Secretary draw up a form of policy for the Board to adopt.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Secretary mentioned House Bill 3500, relative to the registering of planners. The Board asked that copy of the bill be obtained and forwarded to them.

Mr. Reynolds discussed Dr. Doxiadis being hired by the Detroit Edison Company to make a study of the water, sewage, and of the possibility of pumping water from the Great Lakes and the sewage disposal solution.

OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

A letter from Mrs. Eunice A. Pardee of the Housing Subcommittee of the League of Women Voters was read.

The letter from Mr. J. Warren Houston announcing his resignation from the Board was read.

The Secretary is to compose a letter of appreciation and present Mr. Houston with a gavel.

A memo from the City Attorney regarding insurance of Board members was read.

Meeting adjourned at 10:35 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

M

Sandra Rausch, 724 W. Lapeer St. presented petitions that the Children of Lansing would like to have City Council and Parks and Recreation Dept. to reconsider the fees for outdoor swimming pools.

Referred to Committee on Parks and Recreation and Park Board.

S-25-66

Petition presented to construct Sanitary Sewer on Hilliard Rd. from Miller Rd. north to serve Lots 66 and 49 of Supervisors Plat of Home Owners Subd.

Referred to Dept. Public Service.

Petition to have 25-mile per hour speed limit signs posted on Hilliard Road between Miller Rd. and Doris St.

Referred to Traffic Board.

Several persons spoke relative to the "Little League Baseball clubs."

Referred to Park Board and Park and Recreation Dept.

By Councilman Dean—

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Lansing:

That the attached claims be allowed and the City Clerk be and she is hereby authorized to draw orders on the City Treasurer for the amount allowed each claimant, in the amount of \$68,408.63.

Adopted by the following vote:

Unanimously.

Council adjourned at 10:45 P.M.

THEO FULTON,
City Clerk.

Lansing, Michigan

June 6, 1966

F/B

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, April 5, 1966

Because of the large number of people present, the meeting was moved to the Council Chambers on the 10th floor of City Hall.

Meeting was called to order at 7:46 P.M. by Chairman Russell H. Fink.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Absent: Manz—1.

HEARINGS

Z-221-65

Community Unit Plan submitted by St. Vincent de Paul Society for property located at 4631 and 4705 South Logan St.

The Secretary gave an explanation of the Community Unit Plan. Mr. Fink gave an accounting of use and ownership of the area surrounding the property in the Community Unit Plan.

Mr. James A. Church, Senior Planner, presented a graphic sketch plan for the site.

Mr. Arthur J. Faggion, Vice President of St. Vincent de Paul Society and chairman of this committee stated that this project is co-sponsored by the St. Vincent de Paul and the Catholic Diocese of Lansing and advised that this will be private housing for low income families that are residing here now, who are respectable and responsible people. This will not be a wayward house or for people from broken homes.

Mr. Bernard Mayotte presented a floor plan layout showing the scope of the project and type of unit. He stated that they will

all be three and four bedroom units. The property is and will be landscaped, under the direction of Jack Drew and Associates, Landscape Architects.

Mr. Black asked about the color scheme on the plat map and was advised that the blue indicated four bedroom units and the yellow three bedroom units.

From the audience the following comments were made:

Mr. Glen Thompson, of 4622 Birchfield presented a petition in opposition to the rezoning and advised that they opposed basically of the scope and size. They feel that there are too many people in the proposed project, making the density too high. He asked what recreational facilities would be available for the children, and stated that Logan Street is overcrowded now and wondered how they would get on it. He stated further concern about police and fire vehicles and how they would get in. The only other access is a 20 ft. alley. Further concern was mentioned about schools, inasmuch as they felt they would be overcrowded. Then he questioned if this was the highest and best use of the land. There are a few vacant homes in the area, and he thought these could be used for the elderly.

Mr. Joseph O'Leary, stated that this plan meets the Federal Housing Administration 221 d 3 which is their community plan for housing per acre. There are 6.1 acres of land involved. The building space is a small percentage. There will be plenty of land for play area. The outlet will be on Reo Road, and that would be used for a thoroughway for further protection. The streets would meet all city requirements. The children of the people proposed to live here are not new people to Lansing and are under the present Board of Education system.

Mr. Edward W. Majdeski of 934 Dornell Avenue stated that he feels this will develop as a ghetto. He felt that they should be put in the homes that are repossessed by the federal government. It is figured there are 2.5 children per family in the average subdivision. Assuming that there are 4 rooms, there will be an average of 6 children per family unit. At this rate with 60 units going, an estimated 300 children would be attending Reo School. There are presently 400 in attendance. For the next two or three years there will be no new schools. Where will these 300 children go? On the play area, he would like to have the developer point this out. He wanted to know how the play area and park area were to be included in this unit. This area was not accessible as a play area before the drain was covered. There is not enough play area now for the children in the area.

Mr. Faggion stated that 51 per cent of all school children in the city are south of Mt. Hope.

Mrs. Milton DeVinney, of 4710 Lowercroft, stated that Reo School was built for 500

children. With these 5 new buildings, how many children will be added to the school this fall?

The secretary explained the tax roll.

Mr. Demetrio Saenz, of 4822 Richmond, stated, "It is proposed to have decent housing for the people being displaced." He felt there will not be a ghetto. It may set a good example.

Mrs. Laura E. Walker, 1222 Olds Avenue, stated that kids are now being bussed to Reo since the Lincoln School is out. Children are not staying in their own yards. There are lots of foxholes in this property and top soil is being borrowed by their parents. The property is depreciating. Mrs. Walker owns 4705 South Logan.

Mrs. James T. Kallman, 4003 Marland Drive, asked about the families to be placed here.

Mr. Faggion advised that they have to abide by government regulations. No quota system or discrimination. It will also be set up so that these units can be purchased. Those based on economic fringe may be cooperative apartments. The Board of Education has plans for building onto Reo School which would eliminate bussing out. There will be a professional manager for the project and St. Vincent de Paul will work to help the people.

Mrs. Kallman then stated that she felt that these people would create a constant problem inasmuch as the low income families would be moving up and out and others would be moving into the area. She asked how they could improve these people if they were going to be in one spot and expect the children to adjust without a play area. She thought there should be a minimum number of families. She thought it should be a homogenous community, and felt that this would be a great problem.

Mr. Majdeski stated that he wondered about the control of these units, and if the standard would be kept up.

Mr. Faggion replied that this would be covered in the contract.

Mr. Joseph T. O'Leary stated that it could be restricted on cleanliness, etc. This is not intended to be a place to house people with morality problems. St. Vincent's have felt the need for more low income housing.

Mr. Steve Snauko of 1837 Beal stated that the people came here with the idea that they didn't want this project because of the children. They do not know the number of children at this time.

Mr. Sam Reist of 1017 Reo Road complained about the children walking on his grass rather than on the sidewalks, and of other expenses he had incurred. He wondered if the developer were going to have a fence around the project.

Mr. O'Leary stated that the plan was given to the City and they have asked the Planning Board to recommend the screening.

Mr. Townsend asked if the alley is going to become a throughfare. He was advised that the alley will be an exit for emergency use only.

Mr. Majdeski then asked about emergency vehicles.

Mr. O'Leary replied that the greatest need is for families that are having trouble finding homes.

Mrs. Richard Conner of 1417 Mary Avenue wondered why these people couldn't move into vacant homes.

Mrs. Clyde Allison of 4618 Lowcroft questioned what was meant that these people would be screened. She then told of the possible damage that could be done by the children.

Mr. Gerald V. Wilcox of 4529 Burchfield asked questions about the minimum salary and the rental costs of these units.

Mr. O'Leary advised that the costs of land and buildings are high and are rising. They anticipate rent from \$75 to \$120 per month.

Mr. Sam Obrecht stated that the screening will enable them to study the morals, credit rating and background of the applicants, the same as any mortgage loan.

Mrs. Royal Springer of 4630 Burchfield asked about the easement on the N.E. corner of the project.

Mr. Royal Springer of 4630 Burchfield asked about the easement on the N.E. corner of the project.

Mr. Marvin J. Schultz of 4607 Burchfield told of the type of homes in the area and how he happened to purchase his. He then stated his concern for the property values of the land.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

At 9:07 P.M. the meeting was adjourned to Court Room No. 1.

S-2-66 Assessor's Plat No. 56

The Secretary explained the purpose of the Assessor's Plat.

There was some discussion on the legality and cost involved in preparing deeds and abstracts being brought up to date.

Mr. Gerald Ernst, City Assessor, advised that it is not mandatory that this new legal description be used.

Mr. Leo Farhat stated it may cost \$2.50 at the time the deed is brought up to date.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-29-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property on South Cedar Street, first lot north of 7020 South Cedar Street described as:

Lot No. 85 of Just-A-Mere Farm Subdivision

from "A" one family residence to "H" light industry district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-37-66

Mr. Reamer Wgle, attorney, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 1147 Case and 728 E. Grand River Avenue from "F" commercial district to "H" light industrial district and mentioned the surrounding zoning. He presented a colored drawing of the area, and asked that the zoning be changed. He stated that North Lansing had changed. There is very little commercial. This particular property has been vacant for a long period of time and the petitioners would like to improve it for a wholesale bakery. The property must be zoned for light industrial which would permit the improvement of this area. The petitioners are presently doing business at 210 N. Washington Avenue. This location is in the Urban Renewal Area and they will have to move elsewhere. The center portion of Lot 7 would be used as an access to Lot 6 which in turn would be used for supplies.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-38-66

Mrs. Ann E. Jones appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 4108 and 4112 South Cedar Street from "A" one family residential to "F" commercial district and advised that everything around the neighborhood is commercial and she wants to bring this into conformance with the rest.

Mr. Reynolds inquired if she were living at this address; Mrs. Jones stated that she rents 4108 and lives at 4112.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-39-66

Mr. Walter O. Estes, Attorney, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the prop-

erty at 4318 South Cedar Street from "A" one family residential to "D-1" professional district and advised that the plans are not available. They anticipate the construction of an office building on this site. They need more than 165 feet so that the entire lot can be used. It was zoned commercial before annexation to the city. The petitioner would like to have it all zoned the same so that it can be used for one purpose.

Mr. Fink asked if they would prefer to have it tabled and was advised that they would not as the petitioner would not like to go through that expense until the rezoning request is decided.

Mr. Black asked if there were no access to this property, meaning that it cannot be used without the front property and was advised "Yes."

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-40-66

Mr. Glen Slucter appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at Jolly Road and Washington Avenue described as:

Lot 12 through 15 inclusive, McIntosh Subdivision No. 1 a part of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of Section 4, Town 3 North, Range 2 West, Ingham County, Michigan excepting therefrom the westerly 150 ft., of the northerly 150 ft., thereof, and road rights-of-way adjacent thereto, being a part of Lot 13, McIntosh Subdivision No. 1

from "A" one family to "D" apartment district and advised that a year ago the corner, 150 foot square, was rezoned to permit a gas station. This was reversed by City Council. Southbrook Hills Subdivision brought about the dilemma. This zoning would be an improvement to the area. A site plan by Jack Drew was presented and explained. They feel there is a need for apartment house units in the south end. They do not need the number of units permitted in the "D" because of the extreme elevation. The land is owned by the oil company. Because of the cost, the land should be used for commercial, professional or possibly multiple dwelling. The minimum number of units is 72 because of the cost factors. With 1½ parking spaces per unit, 108 parking space must be provided. Ingress and egress to the area would be from both Jolly Road and Washington Avenue.

Mr. Reynolds asked the number of bedrooms and was advised that they are all two-bedroom units. They may have to change because of land.

Mr. Reynolds then inquired if the easement will be used for green area and was advised that it would.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-41-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the vacant lot on Hammond Street between Logan and Birch described as:

Lot No. 11, Block No. 4, Cadwell's Addition to the City of Lansing

from "B" one family to "D-M" multiple family dwelling district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-42-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 628 West St. Joseph from "D" apartment to "F" commercial district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-43-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 712 North Pine Street from "C" two family to "J" parking district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-45-66

Dr. Robert Goodman appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 3200 North Grand River from "C" two family to "D" apartment district and reported that he is owner and resident of the property. Prior to 1958 this was in Lansing Township. He purchased it in August, 1958 after annexation. In June, 1961 the property was rezoned to "C" two family. Dr. Goodman would like to make a structural change and needs the "D" zoning. He gave a description of the area. He has off-street parking which is adequate. The building and grounds are well maintained and landscaped. He is located on a busy thoroughfare. This rezoning would be higher than a lot of uses on Grand River.

Mr. Reynolds asked why he wasn't asking for "D-1" professional in place of the "D" apartment housing.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-46-66

Mr. H. Paul Koepke, Jr. representing Shell Oil Company appeared in behalf of

the petition to rezone the property at 1013-1015 West Main Street from "C" two family to "F" commercial district.

The Secretary explained that the Master Plan calls for industrial and a portion of the property was taken for state highway use.

Mr. Koepke stated that the state highway asked for cooperation on the one-way Logan, taking 17 feet of their property for the fifth lane for a right hand turning movement which cut into the pump island and forced them to move their building back. They would like to use this property for egress. To give safe ingress and egress they need the additional property for a curb cut. The turning lane will be ready this summer. The state is making an appraisal now.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-47-48-49-66

Mr. Leo Farhat, Attorney, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the properties at 2405 and 2501 East Mt. Hope Avenue from "A" one family to "D-1" professional office district and Land along and in back of 2517 East Mt. Hope Avenue described as:

Private Road "A" (said road running along the East boundary of Lots 33 and 39), also Lots numbered 25, 26, 27, 29, 39, and 34 except the South 200 feet of the East 118.0 feet of said Lot 34 and except the West 80 feet of the South 200 feet of said Lot 34 of Supervisor's Plat of Fidelity Farms, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple district and explained that one portion was before the board before and was denied, but now have three parcels and would like the board to reconsider. For uniform development of this land they have something that would be of use to the citizens and compatible with the surrounding development. Site plans are to be presented to the board. They are hesitant to go into any further specifications because of former denial. They are very desirous of the rezoning and will work with the planning staff on site plan, traffic plan, etc., but do want some indication of a favorable decision. There are many rumors that the city has plans for this land, that it would be used for parking, also that the Board of Water and Light might want to use some of the area. There is no sewer or water in the area.

The Secretary inquired if the petitioners were willing to plat and dedicate streets and Mr. Farhat stated that it would be considered.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-50-66

Mr. John G. Doyle appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 824 N. Pine Street from "C" two family district to "D-M" multiple dwelling district. He would like to build a two-family dwelling. He will remove the present structure and build a multiple family dwelling. There are 8 units permitted on the lot area. On the type of construction, the same as that constructed at 826 North Walnut. There would be a redwood fence completely around the property and there would be parking in the rear. This would be an improvement to the area. They want to put all single bedrooms. They will be willing to work out the details with the staff. He presented a sketch that would be modified to fit the land.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-51-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property on Rosedale Road, Lot No. 19 described as:

The North 80 ft. of Lot No. 19, Supervisor's Plat of Elmwood Farms, a subdivision of the E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 9, T2N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one family to "C" two family district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-52-66

Mr. William Kritselis, Attorney, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at the N.E. corner of South Washington and Elm Street and 109 and 113 East Elm Street described as:

The South $3\frac{1}{2}$ rods of Lots 8 and 9 of Block 199, Original Plat, City of Lansing, and the west $\frac{1}{2}$ of Lot No. 10, Block 199, Original Plat, City of Lansing

from "F" commercial and "D" apartment to "F-1" commercial and "J" parking district. Mr. Kritselis advised that they are asking for the change to facilitate sale of the present site. They anticipate building a new church.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-53-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 1210 West

Saginaw Street from "B" one residential, "F" commercial to "D" apartment and "J" parking district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-54-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 811 Fred Street from "A" one family residential to "C" two family district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-55-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 929 Banghart Street from "B" one residential to "G-2" wholesale district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-56-66

Mr. Robert F. Dutcher, Trustee for the First Methodist Church appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 3800 block of Delta River Drive described as:

The south 100 ft. of North 350 ft. of that part of the S.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 6, Lansing Township, T4N, R2W, beginning at the N.W. corner of the Wm. Birkholz property line, exclusive of the highway right-of-way, thence east 274 feet parallel to the property line; thence S. at right angles 750 ft.; thence W. at right angles and parallel to Delta River Drive 274 ft., thence North along Waverly Road to Birkholz property line 750 feet to the place of beginning.

from "J" parking to "B" one family and requested that only 100 ft. of the "J" parking area be rezoned. He presented plans and discussed taking advantage of the topo. They want to expand the seating to accommodate 500 persons. They anticipate 3 person per car for parking.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-57-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 2800 Blk. Devonshire described as:

That part of the southwest $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 27, T4N, R2W, Lansing Township, Ingham County, Michigan lying

east of the M.C.R.R. described as: Beginning at a point on the East and 1859.5 ft. E. of the W. one-quarter post of said Sec. 27, said point of beginning also being the N.E. cor. of Central Warehousing Plat; thence S. 790.7 ft. along the E. line of said plat; thence on a Central Warehousing Plat; thence S. 790.7 ft. along the E. line of said plat; thence on a bearing of S. 16° 45' E. 331.4 ft. along the E. side of said plat to the S.E. corner of said plat; thence E. 685.3 ft.; thence N. 1111.7 ft. more or less to the east and west one-quarter line of said Sec. 27; thence west along said one-quarter line 779 ft. to the point to beginning, containing 20 acres of land, more or less, subject to all restrictions and easements of record; also Lot 17 of Central Warehousing Subdivision

from "A" one farm single dwelling to "D" apartment district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-58-66

Mr. Stanley Stelmashenko appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property on the east side of Linlawn Avenue between Lincoln Avenue and Greenlawn Avenue described as:

Prairie Village Subdivision, part of the S.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 27, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham Co., Michigan

from "I" heavy industrial to "D-M" district and advised that he had discussed this with the Planning Department and requested the "D-M" or light industrial. The Building Department layed out two buildings proposed for the site. He has a certificate of survey and copies of the proposed buildings. All units will be two bedroom.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-59-66

Mr. Ronald Morgan, Attorney, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone a parcel at 827 East Michigan Avenue from "F" commercial to "G-2" wholesale district and advised that they only want Lot 4 rezoned. They presented plans to construct a facility for enclosing their loading and unloading dock. They do not plan for expansion. At the present time, they are legal non-conforming. They have a fleet of 10 trucks and a semi which blocks 8th Street. No storage will take place. The structure will solely be for operation now. This will only serve to benefit and beautify the area. The addition will serve as a garage for trucks. Parking now is on a lot.

Mr. Reynolds asked if they manufactured potato chips here; if so they might need light industrial. Mr. Morgan advised that the nonconforming status for the manufacture of the chips will remain the same. The "G-2" is for trucks only.

The Secretary advised that the Board can recommend light industrial for the manufacturing area if they wish.

Mr. Siebert asked about ingress and egress, and was advised that it is now off Michigan Avenue. An additional parcel on Jerome will be requested for "F." A petition will be presented shortly. Eventually all ingress and egress will be off 8th Street.

Mr. Black stated that he was confused on the status. The "G-2" would allow only wholesaling and not manufacturing and he thought they should get it all approved at once.

Mr. Fink asked if the new acquisition would be requested for "J" parking and was advised that he thought this should be the right zoning. It is all zoned "D" multiple at present.

Mr. Fink then asked if there were a request for the small portion, and was advised yes, but it is not listed on the legal. The reason for the request is a construction problem. They will request the additional parcel as soon as possible.

Mr. Charles Seyfert stated that they would appreciate anything that could be done. It is important to them because they are faced with 2 problems; (1) Have had quite a bit of a problem with police and fire departments for blocking the street. By granting permission to make this move, it would clear the thoroughfare. This would improve the area. (2) They have a problem of getting potatoes in. Farmers have trouble getting labor. Granting would allow them to place the potatoes in crates of 2,000 pounds at a time. They are in a hurry before harvesting potatoes in this part of the country. This will not increase production facilities. Two buildings on the property are to be removed.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-60-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 5334 South Cedar Street from "D" apartment to "F" commercial district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-61-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 700-800 Block Armstrong Road N. described as:

Lots 1 through 12 inclusive of Penn.-Cedar Subdivision

from "A" one family district to "D" apartment district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-62-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 700-800 Block Armstrong Road N. described as:

Lots 13 through 24 inclusive of Penn.-Cedar Subdivision

from "A" one family to "D" apartment district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-14-66

Mr. Archie Fraser, Attorney, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at the corner of Collins Road and Cavanaugh Road connector described as:

Commencing on Section line 100.31 ft. East of the Southwest corner; thence Northerly along East ROW line of Highway I-496 to the Southerly line of Cavanaugh Road connector; thence South 86° 09' 45" E. 788 ft.; thence South 44° 52' 49" East to the West ¼ line; South along the ¼ line to the South Section line; thence West to the P.O.B. except the South 333 ft. of the East 183 ft., Section 36, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

revised by letter of March 22, 1966 to:

A parcel of land located on the S.E. Quadrant of I-496 (US-127) and Dunkel (Cavanaugh Rd.) in the S.W. ¼ of Section 36, City of Lansing, County of Ingham, State of Michigan: beginning at the intersection of the Easterly Limited Access ROW fence of Highway I-496 with the Southerly Limited Access ROW fence of Dunkel Road, which is 75.5 ft. Southerly of centerline of Dunkel Road and 102.5 ft. from the center line of Northbound roadway of Highway I-496; thence Southerly 700 ft. along the Easterly Limited Access ROW fence of Highway I-496; thence Easterly 600 ft.; thence Northerly 330 ft.; thence Easterly 380 ft. to the Westerly ROW line of Collins Road; thence Northerly 100 ft. along the Westerly ROW line of Collins Road; thence Northwesterly 298.85 ft. along the ROW line to an iron pin in the Southerly ROW line of Dunkel Road thence Westerly along the Southerly ROW line of Dunkel Road 793.32 ft. to the point of beginning.

from Agricultural-Residential "A" one to "F" commercial district and mentioned the previous request and the Board's recommendation to Council. On the sewers and utilities, they realized this is a problem but they are ready, willing, and able to come to the city's utilities. The size is now 12.5 acres for the inn itself and two wings. On the public facilities, Michigan State University indicated they are interested in this in behalf of the state police. This land is in the City of Lansing and the proposed use would be a high tax base. Would add to it this high cost land. Other land is somewhat crowded which is an invitation for more and more people here and the development will bring creditable operation. On the land use, the highway cloverleaf will permit no ingress or egress. This is an ideal site for this type of accommodation—in sight of I-96 and close to the University.

Mr. Terry Masterson, of the Real Estate Section of Hospitality Inn of Cleveland, a subsidiary of Standard Oil introduced Mr. Stewart Barnes and Mr. Lee Davis. Mr. Masterson presented plot plans for the area. He advised that they have checked with the city on the proper procedure for obtaining the utilities needed. Mr. Clyde Stephens provided limited cost figures. They could use a package sewer treatment unit. He feels that cooperation of the property owners in the area can be obtained. They feel a sponsor could be proposed to the city to help encourage development of this area. This is close to Olds and other plants as well as to down town and to the University.

The Secretary advised that the land is unplatted and asked if they would be interested in platting the property for future use? The petitioners answered that this would be agreeable, and again mentioned sewer and water and posed the suggestion of getting these put in the area.

Mr. Donald Whipp, Jr. stated that he was developing the S.W. quadrant of Duncel Rd. He feels that the projected use is desirable and would be happy to have someone help them with the request for sewer. He has conducted an economic feasibility study and feels it is a good spot for this type of development.

Mr. Joe Pentecost advised that he hoped the Board will give favorable consideration. They have canvassed the area and found no objections to the proposal. He presented aerial photographs.

Mr. Leland Carr reiterated that Michigan State University believes that the natural boundary for the campus is I-496. North of the subject property has been arranged for by the University. The act was passed in 1965 and became effective 90 days from the close of the term, \$2,800,000.00 was appropriated to assist the State Police and ten other agencies. The site is very much under consideration. They might not settle on this. If they didn't, it will be used as part of Michigan State University. Will make a trade if it is not used for present

state police post. In the Urban Renewal area downtown, there is also a motel and can't see where this is in the best interest of the program and in the best interest of the University. The package sewer is the height of folly. He asked the Board to stand firm on their previous recommendation.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Recess from 11:50 to 12:25 A.M.

BUSINESS SESSION ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-227-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the Community Unit Plan of Capitol Apartments for the 900-1000 Block of Allegan and Washtenaw submitted by Lee Halstead as amended, be returned to the developer for a revised plan containing development at a density of 1500 square feet per family or 29 dwelling units per acre, with a parking ratio of 2 parking spaces per unit.

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Siebert that the rules of procedure be suspended to allow Mr. Halstead to speak.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Halstead advised that this is a one to one and a quarter million dollar project and asked the committee to review all density for financial purposes. He will work along with the Board's recommendations.

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the original motion be withdrawn and that the plan be approved with a density of 1500 square feet and that the developer revise the plans in accordance with the recommendation and present them for the meeting of April 19th.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-20-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Capital Advertising Inc. to rezone a parcel at 814 North Capitol Avenue from "D-M" multiple district to "D-1" professional district be granted and that

Lots 7, 8, 11, and 12 of Block 51 of Town of Michigan Subdivision

be rezoned from "D-M" multiple district to "D-1" professional district.

The Board believes this area is desirable for professional office use particularly of a type not normally located in high-rise office buildings but which is characteristic of the Central Business District fringe areas. The Board is concerned, however, with the sewer capacity problems that could arise from the high residential densities allowed in the "D-1" professional district.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds, Siebert.

Nays: None.

Z-23-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Paul C. Bent to rezone property in the 2800 Block of Pleasant Grove Road described as:

Beginning on the East line of Pleasant Grove Road 75 feet North of the East and West $\frac{1}{4}$ line of Section 29, T4N, R2W, Township of Lansing, thence North 75 feet, thence East 150 feet, thence South 75 feet, thence West 150 feet to beginning

from "A" one family residential district to "C" two family district be denied.

The change would be contrary to the established land use pattern in this area, east of Pleasant Grove Road.

The change would create an isolated district, unrelated to similar districts, i.e., this would be spot zoning.

The change would constitute a grant of special privilege to an individual as contrasted to the general welfare.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be developed in accord with existing zoning.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Heino, Gaus, Reynolds, Siebert—6.

Nays: Fink—1.

Z-24-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Malcolm Milks to rezone property at 820 North Capitol Avenue from "D-M" multiple district to "D-1" professional district be granted.

The Board believes this area is desirable for professional office use particularly of

a type not normally located in high-rise office buildings but which is characteristic of the Central Business District fringe areas. The Board is concerned, however, with the sewer capacity problems that could arise from the high residential densities allowed in the "D-1" professional district.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-32-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Ralph E. Oppen to rezone a parcel at 1010-1018 E. Greenlawn and 2600 Alpha Street from "A" one family district to "D-M" multiple district be denied.

Increased density at this location without direct access to a major street would increase the traffic and activity through the single family area.

The density allowed under the "D-M" multiple district would be contrary to existing residential development.

Mr. Fink stated that he disagreed with the committee's recommendation and felt that this is a transition and that the Board is becoming negative to the multiple family needs of the city.

Mr. Reynolds stated that he agreed with Mr. Fink, in part. In general, the committee is against this "D-M" because of the lot size.

Mrs. Bretz then reported that they must use the church property for a roadway.

Mr. Fink then countered with Alpha Street is open.

Mr. Reynolds asked if there were public utilities in the area, and was advised there were. It is all single family, one house is to go.

Motion failed by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Heino, Siebert—4.

Nays: Fink, Gaus, Reynolds—3.

Z-33-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Milton Bailey to rezone a parcel on the southeast corner of S. Washington and Garden Street described as:

Lot 3, Block 2, Hall's Third Add. Lot 2, Block 2, Hall's Third Add. Lot 1, Block 2, Hall's Third Add.

from "C" two family and "F" commercial to "J" parking and "F-1" commercial district be granted as follows:

The west 100 feet of Lots 1 and 2,
Block 2 Hall's Third addition

from "F" commercial district to "F-1" commercial district;

The east 20 feet of Lots 1 and 2,
Block 2 Hall's Third Addition

from "F" commercial district to "J" parking district;

Lot 3, Block 2 Hall's Third addition

from "C" two family district to "J" parking district.

The following screening provided along the east line of the "J" parking area except that it shall not project in front of the established residential setback on Garden Street.

A three foot high cyclone type fence, with dense evergreen plantings of a mature height of five feet to five feet six inches.

In recommending approval, the Board considered the following factors:

PRO:

1. The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as general commercial.
2. The property northeast of this site is proposed for industrial expansion.
3. Some of the development in this area does not provide the required front yards.
4. Any new development in this area that complies with the proposed use, will upgrade the area and encourage other property owners to do the same.

CON:

1. "F-1" commercial zoning does not provide for any front yard setbacks.
2. It is not impossible to make use of the property under the existing zoning regulations.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Fink, Heino, Gaus, Reynolds, Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Abstain: Bretz—1.

Z-36-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that

the petition by Richard Herrmann to rezone property located at 600 -6 -8 -12 North Logan and 1014-1018 West Lapeer Street described as:

Lot 16, 14, and 12 of White's Subdivision of Lot 2 and 3 of Block 11 of Claypool's Subdivision, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "C" two family district to "J" parking district be granted. Screening to consist of a buffer strip of gravel or planted grass along the west and south 10 feet of Lot 16 and the south 10 feet of Lots 14 and 12 of the entire zoning lot. A privet or similar deciduous hedge shall be planted along the east and north line of said buffer strip on Lot 16, and the north line of said buffer strip on Lots 14 and 12 except at points of ingress and egress.

The Board further recommends that:

The west 10 feet of Lot 17 of White's Subdivision of Lots 1 and 4 of Block 11 of Claypool's Subdivision

be rezoned from "F-1" commercial district to "J" parking district. This district shall serve as a buffer strip consisting of gravel or planted grass with a privet or similar deciduous hedge planted along the east line of said district beginning at a point 50 feet south of the south ROW line of Saginaw Street.

Lighting of a minimum of 2/10 lumens per square foot is to be provided on the parking area so directed as not to affect adjacent properties or passing motorists.

The Board believes that the screening will complement the residential uses in the vicinity and prevent the scattering of debris from the commercial use.

It is further recommended that the developers of the site consult the City Traffic Engineer regarding ingress and egress to the parking area and future traffic flow in the area.

Mr. Fink stated that he disagreed with the 10 foot setback on Lapeer and Logan and wanted the staff to justify.

The Secretary stated that the setback is established and will maintain the character of the area.

Mr. Richard Herrmann stated that the developers would like a 5 foot setback.

Mr. Black stated that the Secretary is correct and it is only making a difference of 5 parking spaces and will make all the difference in the world to the neighborhood and the people in general.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Gaus, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

STREETS COMMITTEE

S-5-66P

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Gaus, that a public hearing be held on the Preliminary Plat of Holiday Plaza in the 6500 Block of South Cedar Street on Tuesday, May 3, 1966 at 7:30 P.M.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

S-6-66P

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Gaus that a public hearing be held on the Preliminary Plat of Potomac Park in the 600-700 Block of West Miller Road on Tuesday, May 3, 1966 at 7:30 P.M.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

S-8-66P

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Gaus, that a public hearing be held on the preliminary Plat of South Penn. Concourse in the 6400 Block of South Pennsylvania on Tuesday, May 3, 1966 at 7:30 P.M.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

S-3-66P

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds, that the Board recommend to City Council that the Planning Board at their meeting on April 5, 1966 approved the Final Plat of the Newport Estates Subdivision and that it be approved by City Council subject to the following conditions:

All public improvements shall be installed with complete public utilities including water, sanitary sewers, storm sewers and full street improvements including street paving, curb and gutter, sidewalks and other such improvements as required under Section VI D of Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

The posting of financial security, as outlined in Section VI B Lansing Subdivision Regulations in the amount of:

| | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|
| Monument Deposit | \$ 600.00 |
| Storm and Sanitary Sewers | 20,000.00 |
| Street Grade and Gravel | 4,200.00 |
| Total | \$24,800.00 |

prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

All other standards and requirements of Lansing Subdivision Regulations and the Michigan State Plat Act, Act 172, Public Act of 1929, as amended, shall apply

Motion carried by the following vote:
Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

FINANCE

Vice-Chairman Kenneth Black took over the chair.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Siebert, that the sum of \$1,810.00 be transferred from the 170 110 full time salaries account to the following:

| | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|
| 170 251 Mileage | \$ 220.00 |
| 170 440 Office Equipment | 40.00 |
| 170 250 Conference | 150.00 |
| 170 122 Extra Help | 1400.00 |

to cover present shortages and anticipated needs, to clarify that which can be credited to the space survey plan for partition moving.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Motion by Black, seconded by Siebert that the secretary be authorized to attend the American Society of Planning Officials convention in Philadelphia, April 16 to 23.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Meeting adjourned at 1:06 A.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, April 19, 1966

Meeting was called to order at 7:37 P.M.
by Chairman Russell Fink.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz,
Reynolds—5.

Absent were: Black, Heino, Siebert—3.

HEARINGS

SS-1-66 Revision of Sec. 36-53 of the
Zoning Ordinance

Mr. Robert L. Rizzuti, Senior Planner,
explained the staff's recommendations which
would exclude apartments from the light
industrial zoning. Mr. Edwin P. Brown,
Assistant Director, presented additional in-
formation regarding the need for this re-
vision.

Mr. Reynolds asked if, in the new ordi-
nance, this was similar, and was advised
that residential would be excluded from
the light industrial.

Mr. Manz asked about the light industrial
on South Washington Avenue and was ad-
vised that this is a warehouse area.

Dr. W. A. Deppa, 326 N. Bridge Street,
Grand Ledge appeared in opposition to
this revision and advised that he has prop-
erty in the light industrial zone but is not
planning to build an apartment on it. It
is too small. He understood this is a stop-
gap measure until the new ordinance is
adopted. He is concerned specifically with
the eroding away of the rights of the prop-
erty owners. It seems to him as though
this exclusion of light industrial is another
erosion. Those people who have invested
in the light industrial area should be able
to rely on the zoning that was in effect
when the original ordinance was adopted.
It seemed to him as though this theory of
conflicting use should be considered at the
time of the adoption of the original ordi-
nance. Since it was zoned light industrial
at that time, it doesn't seem cricket to dis-
cover this conflict at this late date. He
wondered about assuring that it could be
used for industrial at a later date. It ap-
pears to him that the Board should not be
able to pass judgment on somebody else's

opinion of the use. He wondered where it
would be more logical to place apartments,
than close to their work.

There may be many people that may
want to live next to an industrial plant.
There may be traffic and fire hazards, but
there are adequate safeguards. He sug-
gested that the present zoning ordinance
be used as adopted until such time as a
new ordinance was adopted. He further
wanted to know what was contemplated for
33 foot lots in industrial zoning.

Mr. Fink advised Dr. Deppa of his right
to request, a rezoning if the property can-
not be used in its present classification. Dr.
Deppa then asked if the Board would ap-
prove spot zoning, and was advised that
they did not condone this.

Further discussion followed on the pos-
sible land use.

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Reynolds
that the Board recommend to City Council
that the "H" light industrial district in the
present zoning code be amended to exclude
the erection of apartment buildings. These
recommendations would change the ordi-
nance to read as follows:

Section 36-53. "H" and "I" districts.
In the "H" light industrial and the "I"
heavy industrial districts the height of
buildings, the minimum dimension of yards
shall be as follows:

1. Height. In the "H" light industrial dis-
trict no building hereafter erected or
structurally altered shall exceed three
stories or forty-five feet, except as pro-
vided in section 36-54 hereof.

In the "I" heavy industrial district
no building hereafter erected or struc-
turally altered shall exceed a height at
the required yard lines of three stories
or forty-five feet, but above this height
one foot may be added to the height of
the building for every foot that the
building or portion thereof is set back
from the required yard lines, provided,
however, in no instance shall a building
exceed six stories or seventy-five feet.

2. Rear yard. No rear yard shall be re-
quired except where the industrial dis-
trict abuts on a dwelling district, in

which case there shall be a rear yard or not less than fifteen feet. (See Section 36-54.)

3. Side yard. Not required except on that side of a lot abutting upon the side of a lot zoned for dwelling purposes in which case there shall be a side yard of not less than four feet. In all other cases a side yard for a business building shall not be required, but if provided, it shall be not less than four feet.
4. Front yard. Where all the frontage on one side of the street between two intersecting streets is located in the industrial districts no front yard shall be required. Where frontage on one side of the street between two intersecting streets is located in the industrial districts and a dwelling district the front yard requirements of the dwelling district shall apply to the industrial districts.

In the "H" light industrial district no building shall be converted or erected for dwelling purposes; provided, however, dwelling quarters may be established in connection with any industrial establishment for watchmen and caretakers employed upon the premises.

The Board's recommendation is forwarded for the purpose of reducing the possibility of mixed uses which on one hand absorbs land needed for future industrial growth and on the other hand places residential units in undesirable environments.

A public hearing on this recommendation was held April 19, 1966.

Mr. Manz stated that if someone had an apartment house in the "H" this would not stop a bump shop from moving in next door.

Mr. Reynolds advised that a few years ago industrial encroached on residential and now residential is encroaching on industrial. This will protect both industrial and the individuals.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds—5.

Nays: None.

BUSINESS SESSION

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Manz that the minutes of February 1, March 1, 8, and 22 be approved.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-1-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Gaus that the Board recommend to City Council that

the petition by George Parisian to rezone a parcel at 2330 Forest Road from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be tabled indefinitely.

The Board received a letter dated April 19th from the petitioner requesting the tabling and advising that they would reapply for a Community Unit Plan in the near future.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds—5.

Nays: None.

STREETS COMMITTEE

ROW-6-66

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz that the Board recommend to City Council that after considering the suggestion of the Public Service Director that a service road, 1900 feet long south of I-96 from Washington Avenue to Richards Road, be named Fisher Drive.

The Board has cleared the name "Fisher Drive" through the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission records and found that this would not be a duplication.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds—5.

Nays: None.

ROW-7-66

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz that the Board recommend to City Council that after considering the letter from Ingham County Probate Court relative to the vacation of an alley off 1518 South Washington Avenue (100 Block of Moores River Drive), that the north 79 feet of the alley be vacated.

On April 2, the original request was amended to ask for the closing of seventy-nine of the eighty feet owned by the church. The Planning Board sees no objection to the vacation of this portion of the alley in that the alley dead ends into property that is owned by the church and is surrounded by property owned by the church.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds—5.

Nays: None.

ROW-9-66

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz that the Board recommend to City Council that

after considering the information you submitted relative to the request of George Breedin to purchase the following described property:

A lot commencing 455 ft. west and 33 ft. south of N.E. corner of Section 32, then South 200 ft. then West 76 ft. then North 200 ft. then East 76 ft. to the place of beginning

being a portion of the abandoned South Washington Avenue, that the property be retained by the city.

Due to the traffic congestion at this intersection (Washington Avenue and Holmes Road) previous studies have considered extension of Washington Avenue to the south. As this area and the four corners of Logan and Holmes expand into commercial activities, the necessity for an improved traffic plan is imperative. In that the property requested for purchase could be needed by the city in the future street and traffic plans, it would not be advisable for the city to sell this property at this time.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds—5.

Nays: None.

S-13-64F

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds that the Board recommend to City Council that approval was given to the Final Plat of Holmes Acres and the Board recommends that it be approved by City Council subject to the following conditions:

All public improvements shall be installed with complete public utilities including water, sanitary sewers, storm sewers and full street improvements including street paving, curb and gutter, sidewalks and other such improvements as required under Section VI D of Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

The Holmes drain easement width, as may be required the Board of Public Service, shall be placed on the face of the plat prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

The posting of financial security, as outlined in Section VI B Lansing Subdivision Regulations in the amount of:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| Monument Deposit 10 @ \$20.00 | \$ 200.00 |
| Street Grade and Gravel | 4,000.00 |
| Storm and Sanitary Sewers | 12,560.00 |
| Total | \$16,760.00 |

prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

All other standards and requirements of Lansing Subdivision Regulations and the Michigan State Plat Act, Act 172, public Act of 1929 as amended shall apply.

Mr. Thomas W. Newton, Planner IV, mentioned that the Holmes Drain easement should be referred to the Public Service Board so that a clarification and correction from 150 to 100 feet can be made. This would allow duplexes to be constructed on Lots 8 and 9.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds—5.

Nays: None.

S-22-65-F

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz that the Board recommend to City Council that approval was given to the Final Plat of Sunset Hills No. 5 and the Board recommends that it be approved by City Council subject to the following conditions:

All public improvements shall be installed with complete public utilities including water, sanitary sewers, storm sewers and full street improvements including street paving, curb and gutter, sidewalks and such other improvements as required under Section VI D of Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

The posting of financial security, as outlined in Section VI B Lansing Subdivision Regulations in the amount of:

| | |
|------------------------------|------------|
| Monument Deposit 4 - \$20.00 | \$ 80.00 |
| Street Grade and Gravel | 1,000.00 |
| Sanitary Sewers | 2,100.00 |
| Total | \$3,180.00 |

prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

All other standards and requirements of Lansing Subdivision Regulations and the Michigan State Plat Act, Act 172, Public Act of 1929 as amended shall apply.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds—5.

Nays: None.

S-28-65

Mr. Newton informed the Board that Mr. Francis Fine had requested the Board to reconsider their recommendation disapproving the final plat of Somerset No. 3 specifically because the plat did not relate

itself to the future public land use of US 127. Plans for the Lake Lansing Road interchange approved by the Bureau of Public Roads were presented to the Board showing that this plat is in conflict with one of the ramps.

The chairman recommended that a letter be forwarded to Mr. Fine quoting the letter from Mr. M. Tarik Ataman.

BUILDINGS AND PROPERTIES

BP-6-66

Motion by Manz, seconded by Reynolds that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the parcel of publicly owned land located in the 1500 Block East Grand River Avenue, be put up for public bid, and that the Planning Board initiate action to rezone this property to "C" two family prior to sale. This change of zoning will allow reasonable use of the land and be in conformance with the zoning in the vicinity.

After some discussion it was decided to hold the zoning hearing first.

Motion by Manz, seconded by Bretz, that the matter be tabled until May 3rd for a Public Hearing on the rezoning back to "C" two family after which the recommendation would be submitted to Council.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

BP-7-66

Motion by Manz, seconded by Reynolds, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that after considering the letter from Ingham County Probate Court relative to the release of a right-of-way across and through Lot 3 of Johnson Addition west of Washington Avenue and south of Moores River Drive (1518 South Washington Avenue), that the request be granted subject to the retention of utility easements.

The area requested for release is owned by the South Baptist Church of Lansing and is no longer needed by the city.

Mr. Gaus remarked that they have been using this for parking for some time and wondered how they were allowed to black top over this easement.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, and Reynolds—5.

Nays: None.

BP-8-66

Motion by Manz, seconded by Gaus, that the Board recommend to City Council that after considering the letter from Lansing General Hospital inquiring if any of the area south of them is available for purchase (2800 Devonshire), that this property be retained by the city.

In view of the existing and proposed use of this land by the city, for the public welfare, it would not be desirable to dispose of it at this time.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds—5.

Nays: None.

After some discussion it was decided to move the mid-month meeting from May 17th to Tuesday, May 24, 1966 at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1, Sixth Floor of City Hall.

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. Reynolds reported that a representative of the Public Housing Authority had recommended that the Housing Commission should look for alternative sites for housing the elderly. It may be a lengthy proposition to acquire the site in the Urban Renewal area now owned by two major oil companies, on which the high-rise-for-elderly has been proposed.

The acquisition of land for expansion of the Community College has been temporarily halted by court proceedings.

ORDINANCE

SS-2-66

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Bretz, that the Board request that City Council set a public hearing on a change in the required lot area in the "C" two family district. This change would make the "C" two family district more compatible with the proposed amendments covering "D-M" multiple and "D" apartment districts which are now before Council. Basically, the changes would require an increase in lot area from 4,000 square feet to 6,500 square feet and a parking requirement of two spaces per family. The change would also require setbacks the same as those proposed for "D-M" multiple, namely a 25 foot rear yard on interior lots and a 15 foot rear yard on corner lots; a 10 foot side yard and a 20 foot front yard.

The Board suggests that the required public hearing be set for the Board by the

City Council for Tuesday, May 24, 1966, 7:30 P.M., Court Room No. 1, Sixth Floor, City Hall.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Brown read a report submitted by Mr. Machtel.

The Space Study was mentioned and a chart showing the proposed office layout was shown to the board.

The report dated March 2, 1966 regarding one way traffic plans from the Traffic Board was mentioned. The Planning Board requested that a copy of the report be submitted to each of them.

Motion by Manz, seconded by Bretz, that the Rules of Procedure be amended to read as follows:

Addition to Section 6.1—a, Page 16, sub paragraph 1)

The Planning Director is hereby authorized to approve or disapprove applications for minor sub-divisions as established in the Subdivision Regulations as officially adopted by the Planning Board.

An appeal of the director's determination may be made to the Planning Board, when presented in writing. The time of such review of the Planning Board to take place in accordance with the Policy and Procedure of the Board.

Mr. Reynolds wondered if more authority could not be delegated to the staff for a smoother operation. He further advised that this should be spelled out specifically.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds.

Nays: None.

Mr. Robert L. Rizzuti, of the staff informed the Board of the date and time of the Public Hearing on the Highway Beautification Act. A resolution prepared by the Staff supporting uniform standards of sign board control was presented for the Board's action. Following an informal discussion, it was agreed by consensus that the staff would poll the Board by telephone to determine whether or not the resolution would be presented to the Bureau of Public Roads.

Z-75-66

Simken Village, 2100 W. Holmes Rd. After some discussion on this revision of the Community Unit Plan, it was ordered to be put on the agenda for May 3rd, at 7:30 P.M. for a Public Hearing.

Meeting adjourned at 10:37 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

M/C

By Councilman Dean—

That the special committee on Pedestrian Overpasses study the possibility of an overpass at Cedar and Maple Streets.

Carried.

By Councilman Smith—

That the Traffic Engineer make a study of the traffic signs "Yield" and "Yield-Right-of-Way."

Carried.

By Councilman Dean—

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Lansing:

That the attached claims be allowed and the City Clerk be and she is hereby authorized to draw orders on the City Treasurer for the amount allowed each claimant, in the amount of \$130,237.38.

Adopted by the following vote:

Unanimously.

Council adjourned at 9:02 P.M.

THEO FULTON,
City Clerk.

Lansing, Michigan

June 27, 1966

F/B

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, May 3, 1966

Meeting called to order at 7:40 P.M. by Chairman Russell H. Fink.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Black, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Absent: Bretz—1.

HEARINGS

S-5-66P

Holiday Plaza: Mr. Thomas W. Newton, Planner IV, presented drawings giving the location of the property, the proposed layout of the lots and the use of the land.

Discussion followed.

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds that the Preliminary Plat of Holiday Plaza be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Final Plat to be developed with public improvements as required by the Michigan State Plat Act and Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

2. Construction and improvement drawings be submitted and approved prior to filing final plat.
3. That all required easements be recorded on the face of the final plat.
4. Pierpont and Mercantile Way shall be increased from 66 feet to 80 feet right-of-way. Pierpont Street shall be a boulevard type street with two 25-foot lanes and a median strip of no less than 18 feet. Mercantile Way shall be a four lane, 48-foot roadway.
5. All lots shall be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.
6. Access on South Cedar Street shall be restricted to an entrance only.
7. This approval will expire one year from the date of the Planning Board action.

Mr. Manz asked that on item 6 does it mean that, unless the final approval is placed before the Board and approved, and presented to Council before a year, the plat would be vacated then?

The Secretary advised that the preliminary plans are valid for one year, but can

be extended. It will require reconsideration at that time. This will eliminate carrying the plat on a preliminary basis for a long period of time which may never develop.

Mr. Siebert asked on item 5, are the entrances big enough for fire and other emergency vehicles? He was advised that they will have a 40 foot radius. The Fire Department has given their approval.

The Chairman opened the meeting for public hearing purposes.

No one from the audience appeared for or against the proposed plat.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

S-6-66P

Patomac Park: Mr. Newton gave an explanation of the location of the plat and the proposed use.

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds that the Preliminary Plat of Patomac Park be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Final Plat to be developed with public improvements as required by the Michigan State Plat Act and Lansing Subdivision Regulations.
2. Construction and improvements drawings be submitted and approved prior to filing of the final plat.
3. That all required easements be recorded on the face of the final plat.
4. All lots shall be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.
5. All streets shall be improved with widths of 36 feet curb face to curb face.
6. A 30 foot sewer easement shall be retained along the property line between Lots 13 and 14.
7. This approval shall expire one year from the date of Planning Board action.

The Chairman advised the Board that he had received a petition with 35-40 signatures in protest of the extension of Kern Street west to Schaefer.

Mr. Manz asked why Kern Street is limited where it is. Could it be extended to Washington Avenue? Would it apply later to standards on area between streets? Mr. Newton advised that the block is long, 1420 feet. Kern Street is placed as it is because of ownership. The street is needed for internal traffic circulation.

Mr. Manz then asked if this is a Supervisor's Plat and was advised that this is a metes and bounds area adjacent to a Supervisor's Plat.

Mr. Black asked the whereabouts of Lot 105 mentioned in the petition, and was advised that it was at the end of the proposed Kern Street to the west.

The Secretary advised that the reason for Kern Street is that the cul-de-sac should not be over 600 feet long. From Kern Street north there is just 600 feet.

Mr. Manz asked if it were located on some other property, would it have to line up with Hein St.? Would this absolve some of the objections of the people on Schaefer?

Mr. Geisenhaver stated that he tried to locate on other property and was unable to do so. He is buying Lot 105.

Mr. Black queried, North of Lot 105, do they have buildings or are they vacant? He was advised that they have buildings on them. There are only two lots vacant there at the present time.

Mr. Gaus asked if he had tried to obtain property between here and Washington Avenue, and was answered by the developer that he had, but no satisfactory price had yet been reached.

Mr. Dwane A. Rees, 6061 Schafer Road, stated that his garage would be only three feet from the lot line. He stated that he purchased in the middle of the block because he didn't want a street near his house. The Washington Avenue frontage is undeveloped. He feels that the owner would like to get rid of this plot also.

Mr. Ray West of 6000 Schafer Road advised that Lot 105 is next to him. The road would go about 8 feet from his bedroom. He is opposed to it.

Mr. Chester Lott, 6005 Schafer Road stated he would be directly in front of Kern. Cars would shine lights in his living room.

Mr. Manz stated he thought there should be some studies on this coming out to Washington Avenue.

Mr. Prentiss stated he was the owner of land on Washington Avenue. The Walter Neller Company had contacted him last year about selling, but no one has contacted him about it since.

Mr. Gaus asked if there was a house on Lot 105 and was advised that the lot is vacant. The lot size is 66 x 132.

The Secretary informed the Board that there would be a 60 foot right-of-way for the extension of Kern Street leaving three feet on both sides.

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz that the matter be tabled for thirty days to allow the developer to talk to the owners on Washington Avenue and to explore the extension of Kern Street to Washington Ave.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mrs. Bretz came in at 8:30 P.M.

S-8-66P

South Penn Concourse: Mr. Tom W. Newton of the planning staff gave the location and proposed use of the land.

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds that the Board send a letter to the developer, Patricia Raggow and Donald Ducharme that the Preliminary Plat of South Penn Concourse was approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Final Plat to be developed with public improvements as required by the Michigan State Plat Act. and Lansing Subdivision Regulations.
2. Construction and improvement drawings be submitted and approved prior to filing plat.
3. That all required easements be recorded on the face of the final plat.
4. All lots shall be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.
5. The South 14 feet of Lot 3 shall be dedicated to the public for street purposes in conjunction with the proposed Pierpont Street.
6. This approval will expire one year from the date of the Planning Board action.

No one from the audience appeared for or against the preliminary plat.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

REZONINGS

Z-75-63

Mr. John Schell of the Walter Neller Company appeared in behalf of the amendment to the Community Unit Plan of Pleasant Grove Apartments located in the 2100 block of West Holmes Road.

Mr. Newton gave an explanation of the amendment proposed and the surrounding area.

Mr. Shell presented pictures and a layout of the proposed development. The land is land-locked and has been undevelopable. There will be a lot of open space and play area. The apartments will rent from \$135 to \$165 per month.

Mr. Manz asked if the entrance street would be adjacent to the professional building and was informed that it would be.

Mr. Siebert asked how many stories, and was advised 2½.

Mr. Reynolds asked the number of units and was informed twelve, each of two bedrooms.

Mr. Tony Nosal asked if the community unit will be buffered from the adjacent properties. He stated that he felt this would be a good project if properly buffered.

Further discussion followed.

Mr. Tom Oaker, representing the adjacent business, recommended to the Board that it approve it for the economic improvement and betterment of the community.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-63-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 3425 North East Street from "A" one family to "G-2" wholesale district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-64-66

Mr. James Kwast appeared for his father in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 1825 and 1827 South Washington Avenue from "F" commercial to "H" light industrial district and advised that this is used as a bake shop. The parking removal has caused the area to continue to drop as a retail use. They have therefore expanded out into different shopping centers. They would like to be given the right to have the change so that they would be operating properly. The parking along the street has been taken away. This causes some problems but it has helped the flow of traffic, however the flow of shoppers is down.

Mrs. Bretz asked why they needed the rezoning. Mr. Kwast stated that the rear needs repair. Behind 1825 they will tear down and rebuild similar to 1827. This will give better appearance and more usable space. This borders to industrial on the rear. Apparently there is a discrepancy

in the alley, it was never dedicated; they are using it for parking.

Mr. Reynolds asked if the south is near the railroad, and the petitioner stated that the building is in the same group of buildings. There is a small shack on one side and a driveway that is usable. Extra property is leased from the railroad for parking privileges. It all paved. This does not interfere with their property.

Mrs. Bretz asked, "Is this property adjacent to the property with houses on?" and was advised that it was.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-65-66

Mr. John M. Cole appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 5500 South Washington Avenue from "A" one family to "D-1" professional offices district and advised that he recently purchased an interest in a machine shop. He is presently located at 2217 West St. Joseph which is to be taken out for the highway program. They propose to build an office in front of the machine shop and consolidate it to the tool supply shop.

Mr. Reynolds asked if the machine shop is non-conforming at the present time and was advised that it is. He further added they will operate the machine shop.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-66-66

Mr. William Wise, Attorney, appeared for Dr. Robert C. June, M.D., in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 815, 819 W. Ionia St. and 218 N. Butler St. from "C" two family to "D" apartment, and advised they wish this rezoning to permit the building of a medical building to be used by two or three doctors for offices only. The building will be one story and will be in conformity with the other architecture in the neighborhood. There will be more than adequate parking—for some 25 cars. The property is owned by Dr. June. He submitted a layout.

After some discussion Mr. Wise advised that the legal will be corrected to request the rezoning to the "D-1" rather than the "D".

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-67-66

Mr. Lee Canady appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 727 and

729 W. Lenawee St. from "C" two family to "E" apartment shop district and stated that they would like to rebuild the masonic lodge. They are being displaced by I-496 and have tried to relocate for over a year. This is the only property in the immediate area. They do not wish to move too far out because of use by area members. Everything south to St. Joseph is owned by Oldsmobile. They want to put up a new building, a portion to be used for a drug store to serve the needs of the community. Closest drug store is at St. Joseph and Lenawee. They feel it would enhance the area.

Mrs. Bretz asked if this was the drug store being replaced and was advised that they have a commitment if they are able to get this rezoning.

Mr. Siebert asked when the lodge is in use will there be a parking problem and was advised that there will be no car problem. The lot is 200 ft. deep. They plan on using 50 ft. for building and whole back for parking area. Lot is 80 ft. wide and they desire a circular driveway.

Mr. Reynolds asked if they are now located on West St. Joseph and was advised that they are. He further stated that this is a Masonic function and there will be no alcoholic beverages.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-68-66

Mr. Keith Otis appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at S.E. corner of Aurelius and Cavanaugh described as:

Lot No. 1 of Supervisor's Plat of Culverdale, City of Lansing, County of Ingham, State of Michigan

from "A" one family residence to "F" commercial district and reported that he has offered to purchase the land for use of office buildings. He feels that this particular commercial would not be applicable for the single family or other residential use because of other commercial uses in the area. He presented a drawing of their plans.

Mr. Manz asked what his business was and he advised that they have a welcoming service and also products. Neither are retail. The only traffic would be hostesses and sales people for meetings once a week.

Mr. Reynolds asked why they need commercial for offices and was advised that this was recommended by the Building Inspector.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-69-66

Mr. Ronald Morgan, Attorney, appeared for Adams Potato Chips, Inc. in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 826 Jerome Street from "D" multiple to "J" parking district. Mr. Morgan stated that this is a companion petition to the 1827 East Michigan Avenue one (Z-59-66) so that loading and unloading space will be from 8th Street. They would like to use this for a parking lot.

Mr. Siebert asked about the "J" parking space and was advised that they do not own this.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-70-66

Mrs. Ada Seeley appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 1549 Knollwood Avenue from "B" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district and advised that she takes care of old folks and has three boarders. The Building Inspector has advised her that she is allowed two old folks and no young ones. Would like to have the privilege of having two or more old folks. Mrs. Seeley told the Board of her tenants and her concern for them as some are handicapped.

Melvin Barnes of 201 Clinton, advised that he had known Mrs. Seeley for many years. She has a big heart and he wanted to recommend the rezoning.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-71-66

Mr. Robert Hands appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 740 Durant Street from "B" one family to "C" two family district and reported that they want it rezoned because of the extension of Oakland Street; he doesn't want to live there.

Mr. Fink asked the size and was informed that it will be two story.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-72-66

Mr. Leo Farhat, Attorney, appeared for Mr. Sam S. Bofysil in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 5900 and 6000 block Haag Road and the 1600 Blk. of West Miller Road described as:

Lots 92, 96, 97, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, and 106 of the plat of Yorkshire Park Subdivision No. 3, (formerly

Delhi Twp.) City of Lansing, Ingham Co., Michigan

and

Lot No. 1 of the plat of Yorkshire Park Subdivision No. 1 (formerly Delhi Twp.) City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" residential to "D-M" multiple dwelling district and stated that he wanted to indicate that across the street from this property in the 6000 block is the first of what will be many multiple dwellings. It has not been building up as residential in the past few years. There is plenty of land area so there will be no overcrowding. This will have no adverse affect on the surrounding area. The land is vacant except for Lot 103 which has a house on it.

The Secretary advised that the development on the East is for a Community Unit Plan which will be the same as single family to the West.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-73-66

Mr. Steven Y. Horiszny, Agent for Rolison M. and Grace Gwisher, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 2228 West Holmes Road from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district and remarked that he believed it would be an advantage to the city to have this rezoned. He told of the commercial zoning and building up of homes in this area. With the heavy traffic, he feels the zoning should be changed.

Mr. Siebert asked about the open strip, and the staff informed him that it was an unimproved alley.

Mr. Tony Nosal stated that he owns property to the east, a gas station. He suggested that the Board take another look at his property. He anticipates a new filling station on the corner. The business corner is too small and more of the corner should be considered for a gas station. He suggested this be done on Board recommendations rather than on petition.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-74-66

Mr. David Swank appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 3718 South Logan Street from "J" parking district to "B" commercial district and stated that he has a car wash on South Logan Street. He got a building permit and there is 25 feet left. He would like 20 feet of the "J" parking rezoned to "F" so that it can be used. He wants to black top

the entire area and to use it. He will build one more stall which will be within five feet of the "J" parking. He would like to build an outside stall which will be open with only a boom and drain to center of building on back wall (on the west). He has discussed this with the Building Department. He only wants the back 20 ft. rezoned to "F". The petitioner was advised to check with the staff on the clarification of the area to be rezoned.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-75-66

Mr. Leo A. Farhat, Attorney, appeared in behalf of the petition by Sam S. Bofysil to rezone a parcel in the 900 Block of Miller Road described as:

Lot 1, 2, and 3, of Southbrook Subdivision (formerly Delhi Township), City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district and called the Board's attention to the area and the fact that it is swampy. There are no single family homes, but there is some commercial on Washington Avenue.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-76-66

Mr. William Erbele appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 2309 South Pennsylvania Avenue from "B" one family to "C" two family residence district and advised the Board that across the street (2208) is two family.

Mr. Fink asked the width of the lot and was advised that it is 38.5 feet with a drive way on one side leading to a double garage.

Mr. Reynolds asked if the petitioner were going to remodel this house or build a new one and was advised that he will use the same house plans for the two family.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-77-66

Mr. Ralph Oppen, agent for Paul Jelinek, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 3200 block of South Pennsylvania Avenue from "H" light industrial and "J" parking to "G-2" wholesale and "J" parking and stated that they intended to get a building permit for this property to build for the State of Michigan Employment Security Commission. They have a signed lease but found the planned building would overlap onto the "J" parking. He presented plans. Open parking will be on the south side.

Mr. Fink asked if this would be a general office structure and was advised that it would be. The leases have been signed and approved and are available to the Board for validity. Both the north and south are "G-2". The "J" parking is interfering with the building. The state requested that the building be completed by November 1st. Mr. Oppen requested Board action as soon as possible as per his letter addressed to Council.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-78-66

Mr. Keith M. Bunce appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 4604 and 4608 North Grand River Avenue from "A" one family and "J" parking to "H" light industrial district and advised that they want to take two long narrow strips and make it into a usable area. There are three kinds of zoning in this parcel. Proposed to compile into all one land use. Property immediately west is warehousing and office now off Grand River. There is 30 foot highway right-of-way making it difficult for development. In order to make development more desirable, I feel that the 200 ft. setback of residential should be proposed for light warehousing and office. There are two houses on the property now.

Mr. Manz asked if the houses are to be removed or left and was informed that they will be taken down eventually. They are older houses.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-79-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 1500 Block East Grand River Avenue described as:

Commencing N.W. corner Lot 13 Assessor's Plat No. 2, thence S. 96.88 ft. more or less; thence S. 46° 48' 30" W. 175.6 ft. to the NW'ly line of East Grand River Avenue; thence N. 41° 16' 73.9 ft. thence N. 41° 48' ft. E. 166.2 ft. to the E'ly corner of Lot 5 Assessor's Plat No. 54, thence NE'ly 75 ft. more or less to beg. being part of Lots 6 and 7 Assessor's Plat No. 54, City of Lansing, Ingham County

from "D" apartment to "C" two family district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-80-66

Mr. Leo A. Farhat, Attorney, appeared for Richard A. and Jorita Stowell in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at

3001 and 3005 South Washington Avenue from "A" one family residence to "F" commercial district and reported that the area is a hodge podge of various uses. The single dwelling and duplex on the east now are in very bad shape. Intend to remove all existing structures and build a new one consisting of barber shop and small shop to the south and above the shop a two family apartment. There is a personal need involved in the new structures. They have one child ill and they must treat his room with a special wall dressing to facilitate breathing. Presently the barber shop must relocate. The use of the land will not detract from the area which is very congested now. Mr. Farhat presented a sketch of the proposed buildings and stated that they are open to suggestions as to where the buildings should be located. The lots are 13,000 sq. ft. There is plenty of room for the buildings as the lots are very deep.

The Secretary asked if the child were ambulatory and was advised "Yes."

Mr. Reynolds asked if this is the barber shop from across the street and was informed that it was (2913 South Washington). He then asked if this is the type of zoning needed and was informed that it is now, but the new zoning ordinance will make it non-conforming.

Mr. Farhat further advised they would come in later and ask for a rezoning if necessary.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-81-66

Mr. Leo A. Farhat, Attorney, appeared for Messrs. Charles Felice and James B. Root in behalf of the petition to rezone the property located a 1212 and 1218 West Jolly Road from "A" residential to "D-M" multiple dwelling district and called the board's attention to the houses in the area. Description may be somewhat misleading. He pointed out that it was his understanding that the owner of the land east of this property is going to request zoning to "F" to extend the commercial and parking at the N.W. corner of Jolly, Washington and Logan. The property is large enough to put up an attractive development. There seems to be no objections from the neighbors. Sometime ago the property was considered by the board and it was recommended that it be used for less dense multiple dwelling. He feels that the present zoning ordinance should be used, also that consideration of this petition will be under the present ordinance. They are requesting that the highest use of the land under this ordinance should be granted.

Mr. Gaus asked when it was considered by the Board and was informed that it was last fall.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Mr. Tony Nosal again made some comments on parking and screening requirements.

Recess from 10:00 to 10:30 P.M.

Mr. Black made the following comments on the Zoning Ordinance:

Copies of the new ordinance have been issued to the Board and are to be returned by a week from today, with comments. It will then be sent to the Consultant and prepared for presentation to City Council.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-167-64

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the amendment to the Community Unit Plan of Cambridge Manor by Robert Savage in the 2800 block of South Waverly Rd. be approved based on the following consideration:

1. That the property adjacent to the Plan would not be adversely affected,
2. That the Plan is consistent with the intent and purpose of the Community Unit Section of the Lansing Zoning Code.
3. The buildings shall be used for residential purposes only.
4. The increase in density is within the capacity of the utilities and facilities in the area and the open space is used to better advantage than when platted in the customary manner.

This approval subject to the following conditions:

If the plan is to be constructed with the boulevard treatment of Mersey Lane, additional right-of-way is to be dedicated as may be required by the Public Service Department to accommodate adequate street pavement and median width.

The plan as amended may be constructed with the existing right-of-way without a boulevard type street.

All previous conditions of approval, as approved by City Council March 22, 1965, with the exception of condition number 9 which reads:

"That the French Provincial Architectural Styling and exterior color rendering schemes now on file with the Lansing Planning Board"

shall apply.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-155-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the petition by John Murphy to rezone the parcel at 4903 N. Grand River Avenue from "A" one family to "H" light industrial and "D-M" multiple dwelling district be tabled for thirty days.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-174-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the amendment to the Community Unit Plan of Hallmark Estates by Joemax Smith at the northeast corner of Moores River and Mt. Hope Ave. described as:

The E. fractional $\frac{1}{2}$ of the S.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 19, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, County of Ingham, State of Michigan, beginning at a point 229.5 feet W. of the S. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 19, thence N. 594 feet, thence W. 660 feet, N. $48^{\circ} 9'$ W. 128.5 feet to an intersection with a line 2 rods from the center of Moore's River Drive, thence S.W. along a line 2 rods from center of Moore's River Drive to its intersection with the S. line of Section 19, thence E. to beginning; except the E. 600 $\frac{1}{2}$ feet by 594 feet N. and S.

be approved based on the following considerations:

1. That the property adjacent to the Plan would not be adversely affected.
2. That the Plan is consistent with the intent and purpose of the Community Unit Section of the Lansing Zoning Code.
3. The building shall be used for residential purposes only.
4. The increase in density is within the capacity of the utilities and facilities in the area and the open space is used to better advantage than when platted in the customary manner.

This approval is subject to the following conditions:

That a link chain or steel strand cable be installed across the fire lane at the north right-of-way line of Mt. Hope Avenue. The chain is to be attached by means of eye-bolts to 3 inch steel posts, four feet high.

All other conditions as approved by City Council November 22, 1965 shall apply ex-

cept that the number of parking spaces shall be increased to 168 as shown on the amended plans.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-191-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by William J. Warner to rezone a parcel a 1320 East Miller Road from "A" one family residence to multiple dwelling and "C" two family district be denied.

The development in this area, south of Miller between Pennsylvania Avenue and Aurelius Road, has been all single family residences. The granting of this request would lead to further requests for multiple uses in this area, which would not be in harmony with the surrounding zoning or use. This change will adversely affect living conditions in this area, principally through the increase in traffic and activity.

This interior parcel of land does not fall within the criteria for apartment zoning adopted by the Planning Board. At the present time there are no school facilities within walking distance, and there are presently no plans for the acquisition of school sites in this area. By increasing the density of development in this area the problem of schools increases.

The Board believes that the previous recommendation of the Planning Board (See Z-111-65) was valid and that this suburban area should be retained for single family development.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-221-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the petition by St. Vincent de Paul Society to rezone a parcel a 4631 and 4705 South Logan Street from "A" one family to Community Unit Plan be tabled until a revised plan is submitted to the Board as per their request.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-227-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert, that the Board recommend to City Council that the amended and revised Commu-

ity Unit Plan of the Capital Apartments by Lee Halstead in the 900-1000 Block Allegan and 900-1000 block Washtenaw described as:

Lots 4, 5, 6, 7, E. 22 ft. of Lot 8, 17, 18, 19 Block 11 Bush, Butler, Sparrow Subdivision

be approved based on the following considerations:

1. That the property adjacent to the Plan would not be adversely affected.
2. That the Plan is consistent with the intent and purpose of the Community Unit Section of the Lansing Zoning Code.
3. The buildings shall be used for residential purposes only.
4. The increase in density is within the capacity of the utilities and facilities in the area and the open space is used to better advantage than when platted in the customary manner.

This approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. The east drive on Washtenaw shall be ONE-WAY (Northbound). The west drive on Washtenaw shall be ONE-WAY (Southbound).
2. The drive on Allegan shall be increased to a minimum width of 24 feet.
3. If the drive on Butler Street is to be two-way, it shall be increased to a minimum width of 24 feet within the right-of-way. A minimum of 12 feet is recommended for one-way traffic.
4. An easement, as may be required by the Public Service Board, shall be retained for maintaining an existing 8 inch combination sewer which runs east and west across the plan approximately 200 feet south of Allegan Street.
5. Continuous screening to be placed along the property lines except at ingress and egress points and in areas that lie within 25 feet of the street right-of-way line, shall consist of either:
 - a) A three foot high minimum chain link fences with dense evergreen plantings of a mature height of 4 feet.
 - b) A 4 foot high minimum decorative wall.
 - c) A privet or similar deciduous hedge with a minimum height of 4 feet, or
 - d) Any other type of screening that may be suggested by the developer subject to the approval of the Planning Board.
6. Landscaping shall be essentially as shown on the types that may be recommended by the Parks Department.

7. Occupancy permit shall be issued after the foregoing conditions have been met.

8. Construction shall begin no later than one year from approval and building permit is to be issued no later than six months from the date of City Council approval.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-14-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Muriel M. Green, Fern Laylin and Hospitality Inns, Inc., to rezone a parcel in the 4800 Blk. of Collins Road (amended by letter of March 25) described as:

A parcel of land located in the S.E. Quadrant of I-496 (U.S. 127) and Duncel (Cavanaugh Road) in the S.W. ¼ of Section 36, City of Lansing, County of Ingham, State of Michigan; beginning at the intersection of the Easterly Limited Access R. and W. fence of Hwy. I-496 with the Southerly Limited Access R.O.W. fence of Duncel Rd. which is 75.5 ft. Southerly of centerline of Duncel Rd. and 102.5 ft. from the centerline of Northbound roadway of Hwy. I-496; thence Southerly 700 ft. along the Easterly Limited Access R.O.W. fence of Hwy. I-496; thence Northerly 330 ft.; thence Easterly 380 ft. to the Westerly R.O.W. line of Collins Road; thence Northerly 100 ft. along the Westerly R.O.W. line of Collins Road; thence Northwesterly 298.85 ft. along the R.O.W. line to an iron pin in the Southerly R.O.W. line of Duncel Rd.; thence Westerly along the Southerly R.O.W. line of Duncel Road 793.32 ft. to the point of beginning.

from "A" one family residential to "F" commercial district be denied.

The Master Land Use Plan shows this area as proposed for public facilities. This proposed change would create an isolated, spot-zoned district not in harmony with the surrounding zoning. The requested change would be contrary to the land use pattern of this area which is farm land and scattered single family residences.

Sewers and other public utilities are not available in this area, nor have they been included in the Capital improvements Program for the next six years.

"F" commercial zoning allows uses that could be detrimental to the surrounding area and future development. Commercial development contiguous with public ownership and use of property to the east

would be incompatible and would create a merchandising advantage not desirable or physically available to other developers. Commercial development in this location would have a long range deteriorating and blighting effect on any eleemosynary institution.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be used in accordance with the existing zoning.

Uncontrolled commercial development, adjacent to public facilities such as this interchange, can create traffic congestion that impairs and tends to nullify the public's investment in its roadway facilities. Such congestion, in effect, can become an infringement by a developer on the use of the taxpayers' dollars expended for the public's good.

The committee believes that the rezoning of areas on the periphery of the city, before the extension of necessary public utilities, is inadvisable and premature when the public health and welfare of the entire community is concerned. One of the basic principles of planning is the logical development of the city along desirable growth lines and not the establishment of isolated districts that cannot adequately be served by the city now or within the foreseeable future.

Motion by Manz, seconded by Reynolds that the Rules of Procedure be suspended to allow Mr. Archie Frazer to ask a question.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Frazer asked if the Board were aware that the State of Michigan is no longer interested in this property?

The Secretary advised the Board that he had a telephone call from Mr. Rosa of the Building Division to that effect.

Mr. Manz stated that he felt this will serve a purpose and doesn't agree with some of the reasons. This will provide traveling service to those on the freeway. On the sewers, it may be ten years before they are built there. They will furnish packaging plant, and should be allowed to develop it. Michigan State has had an opportunity to buy it, and he feels it shouldn't be held up for the University to buy it.

Mr. Fink remarked that he understands the University is desirous of this space.

Mr. Manz added that later tonight another zoning such as this will be up for action and he feels this is just as important a decision as the other one.

Mr. Reynolds stated that he was not in favor of the previous recommendation.

The Secretary commented to the Board that the Staff report states the beliefs of the staff at this point.

Mr. Black stated that he felt that it would be best for the people this way. It is an isolated spot for a motel. The land should be kept free for the University if they want it.

Motion failed by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Siebert—5.

Nays: Gaus, Manz, Reynolds—3.

Z-21-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the petition by John T. and William R. Murphy to rezone a parcel at 6911 South Cedar Street and 1300-1301 Brookdale Street from "A" one family residential to "F" commercial district that

The rezoning of the property on the southeast corner (Lots 97 and 98) of Cedar Street and Brookdale be denied.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that:

The rezoning of the property on the northeast corner of Cedar Street and Brookdale (Lots 99 to 104 and 107) be tabled for 30 days to allow the owners time to submit an overall development plan for the area showing adequate off-street parking and a proper transition of use to the east.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-22-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Kenneth S. DeKubber to rezone a parcel at 3327 W. Holmes Road from "A" one residential to "C" two family district be denied.

The change would create an isolated district, i.e., this would be a spot zone. Development of the properties south of Holmes Road in this area have not been contrary to the existing regulations. There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be used in accord with the existing zoning.

Site plans were shown to the Board that were submitted after the Zoning Committee had made their recommendation on

April 5th. It was the consensus that there should be no change in the recommendation.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-25-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Dr. M. C. Loree to rezone a parcel at 120 West Hillsdale from "D-1" to "F" commercial district be granted.

Because zoning has such a direct effect upon future development patterns of the city, it should be based upon a carefully evolved development policy. The recent studies by Vilcan Leman and the Planning Board on the Central City indicates this area as general business. The concept of this study regarding the land use and zoning has been accepted by the Planning Board.

The change would not be contrary to the established land use in the area, which is mixed commercial and professional. A public parking lot is presently under construction immediately to the north of this site which will help to relieve some of the off-street parking problems that now exist in the area.

The Board does not believe the proposed use and change of zoning will adversely affect property values in the area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-26-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Calvin Hildenbrand of H. and H. Builders to rezone a parcel in the 3800 Blk. Inverary described as:

Lots 389, 390, 391, 392, and 393 of Eton Downs No. 5, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one family residence to "C" two family district be denied.

The change would adversely influence living conditions in the single family neighborhood principally through the increase of traffic and activity. The change would constitute a grant of a special privilege to an individual as contrasted to the general welfare.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be used in accord with the existing zoning. The orientation of these lots, being on the interior residential street rather than fronting on Waverly Road, a primary thoroughfare, makes this property desirable for single family development.

Mr. Manz stated that it is generally developed along Waverly other than single family. Petitioner will amend.

Motion by Manz, seconded by Reynolds that "C" two family be granted along Waverly Road. (Lots 390, 391, and 392).

Mr. Black remarked that the amendment would negate adverse comments and would not accomplish very much.

Mr. Manz replied that the driveways would be on Waverly Road.

Mr. Vernon C. Fountain, Planner VA stated that curb cuts would not be allowed on Waverly Road.

Mr. Fink stated that Waverly is a major thoroughfare north and south and that the staff have been working on a study of this.

Mrs. Bretz reminded the Board that a protest has been filed, and Mr. Manz stated that some of the protesters are two blocks away.

Motion on the amendment failed by the following vote:

Yeas: Manz and Reynolds—2.

Nays: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Siebert—6.

Motion on the original recommendation carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: Manz—1.

Z-27-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Paul A. Collier to rezone a parcel at 1300 East Miller Road from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied.

This change would be contrary to the established land use pattern in this area south of Miller Road which is single family and would create an isolated district unrelated to similar districts, i.e., this would be a spot zone. The basic land use or development has not changed in this area.

The change will adversely influence living conditions in the neighborhood principally through the increase of traffic and

activity. This would constitute a grant of a special privilege to an individual as contrasted to the general welfare.

Large parcels of land such as this should be incorporated into an overall plat of the area, to insure proper development of adjacent lands. There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be developed in accord with the existing zoning.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-28-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by the Top Hat Motel Corporation to rezone a parcel at 6810 South Cedar Street from "A" one family to "F" commercial district be denied as filed and that the

Easterly 40 feet of the property lying west and parallel to the westerly right-of-way line of South Cedar Street

be rezoned from "A" one family to "J" parking and the

Balance of the property

be rezoned from "A" one family to "F" commercial district.

The change would not be contrary to the established land use pattern.

The residential lots fronting on Just-A-Mere and abutting the south line of this property are approximately 400 feet in depth, therefore the Board believes that this change of zoning will not adversely influence living conditions in the neighborhood.

The changing conditions that have occurred in this area relating to both the use and zoning of land has made this site less desirable for single family use.

Mr. Reynolds asked if it is a motel now and was informed that it was.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-29-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Mr. and Mrs. Thomas J. Fisher to rezone a parcel in the 7000 Blk. South Cedar Street described as:

Lot No. 85 of Just-A-Mere Farm Subdivision

from "A" one family district to "H" light industry be denied. The Board further recommends that this property be considered for "D-M" multiple, if the proposed amendments regarding the density and off-street parking requirements—1500 square feet per unit and 2 parking spaces per unit are adopted.

This change would create an isolated district unrelated to similar districts, i.e., this would be a spot zone.

The change may adversely affect property values in the vicinity and may therefore deter the improvement of development of adjacent properties.

Strip industrial or commercial development along major streets reduces the traffic carrying capacities and detracts from planned development centers.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-30-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Mildred Beale to rezone a parcel in the 2900 Blk. North Grand River Avenue described as:

Com. int'n N. and S. $\frac{1}{4}$ line and S'ly line of 100 feet R/W Grand River Ave., thence N. $68^{\circ} 26'$, W. 140.7 ft. S. $23^{\circ} 44'$, W. 272.45 ft. to N. bank of Grand River, S. $64^{\circ} 16'$, E. 161.55 ft. along said bank, N. $21^{\circ} 34'$, E. 284 ft. to said S. R/W line, N. $68^{\circ} 26'$, W. 10.13 ft. to beg.; Section 5, T4N, R2W

from "A" one family district to "C" two family district be granted.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as medium density residential. The density allowed under this request is in keeping with the Master Plan recommendation.

The change would not necessarily be a spot zone since the area to the east was approved as a Community Unit Plan (now expired) for approximately 8 units per acre.

The site has direct access to a major street.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-31-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Frank L. and Miriam R. Cook to rezone a parcel at 3804 South Pennsylvania Avenue from "A" one residential to "F" commercial district be denied.

This area is designated as residential on the Master Land Use Plan. This change would create an isolated district unrelated to similar districts, i.e., this would be a spot zone. Commercial uses adjacent to residential uses is detrimental to both.

The change could very well deter the improvement or development of the other properties in the immediate area in accord with the existing zoning.

This change would constitute a grant of a special privilege to an individual as contrasted to the general welfare. There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot continue to be used in accord with the existing zoning.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-35-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Dale K. Weber, Executive Vice President of Heatherwood Farms Co. to rezone a parcel in the 200 Block LaSalle Boulevard, Lansing, Michigan described as:

Lot 161, Midway Subdivision No. 3,
City of Lansing, Michigan

from "A" one family residential to "J" parking district be denied.

Residential areas should be protected against the encroachment of non residential uses and vice versa. The proposed change is contrary to the Master Land Use Plan which proposes this for residential medium density (4 to 10 dwelling units per net acre).

Deed restrictions on the property limit the use to residential only. The deed restrictions allow two family development to take place, which is also considered to be a proper transition between single family and industrial or commercial development.

Section 36-2. Interpretation, purpose, and conflict of chapter of the Zoning Ordinance on page 604 reads:

"In interpreting and applying the provisions of this chapter, they shall be held to the minimum requirements for the promotion of the public safety, health, con-

venience, comfort, prosperity, or general welfare. It is not intended by this chapter to interfere with or abrogate or annul any easements, covenants, or other agreements between parties, provided, however, where this chapter imposes a greater restriction upon the use of buildings or premises or upon height of buildings, or requires larger open spaces than are imposed or required by other ordinances, rules, regulations or by easements, covenants or agreements, the provisions of this chapter shall govern.

Mr. Reynolds asked if there would be no egress off LaSalle. The petitioner had requested use of the property on industrial complex. Are we limiting access of LaSalle?

Mr. Manz advised that the deed restriction will not allow this.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Siebert—6.

Nays: Manz, Reynolds—2.

Z-37-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Reamer Wigle representing the Pogoncheff Family to rezone a parcel at 1147 Case Street and 728 Grand River Avenue from "F" commercial district to "H" light industrial district be granted.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as industrial. The Board does not believe the proposed change will have any adverse affect on the adjacent properties.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-38-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Ann E. Jones to rezone a parcel at 4108 and 4112 South Cedar Street described as:

Lots 27 and 28 of Jessop Home Gardens

from "A" one family to "F" commercial district be denied as filed and that

The east 120 feet of the property be rezoned to "F" commercial and

The balance of the property be rezoned to "J" parking district.

Screening along the west line of the "J" parking district to consist of 5 feet 6 inch high dense evergreen plantings.

This site falls within the general commercial strip along South Cedar St.

This change would not be contrary to the established zoning and land use along this part of South Cedar Street.

Because of the existing uses and zoning adjacent to this site, it would be unreasonable to retain this "A" one family zoning.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-39-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the petition by Gertrude Bloomquist and Walter O. Estes, her attorney, to rezone the property at 4318 South Cedar Street from "A" one residential to "D-1" professional district be tabled for a rearrangement study and a possible plat.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-40-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Glenn E. Slueter, Paul A. Lewis and Robert D. Smith as agents for Marathon Oil Company to rezone a parcel at Jolly Road and South Washington Avenue described as:

Lots 12 through 15 inclusive, McIntosh Subdivision No. 1, a part of the northwest quarter of Section 4, Town 3 North, Range 2 West, Ingham County, Michigan, excepting therefrom the westerly 150 feet of the northerly 150 feet thereof, and road rights-of-way adjacent thereto, being a part of Lot 13, McIntosh Subdivision No. 1

from "A" one family district to "D" apartment district be denied as filed and that the property be rezoned to "C" two family district subject to platting.

The Board believes that this change will allow reasonable development compatible with the surrounding area. The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as low density residential.

The density and building heights allowed in the "D" apartment district would be completely out of character with the established single family area. The change would adversely affect living conditions in the immediate area principally through an increase of traffic and activity. Apartments, as requested, would change the character of the area, and would have a direct effect on the single family development to the south.

Increased density will increase the load on public utilities and facilities.

The change would constitute the grant if a special privilege as contrasted to the general welfare.

Transitional Zoning. One of the principles of zoning is that all land in a zone be subject to the same regulations. This is basically sound, but it cannot be applied here justly at the boundaries of two dissimilar districts. For instance, where a business or apartment zone abuts a single-family zone, the edges of the latter are subject to adverse influences and pressures of greater populations and building densities, higher and larger buildings, greater traffic, and similar factors. Residential properties and adjoining commercial or industrial districts are similarly affected. Such residential property may, under certain circumstances, be less desirable, its value may be reduced, and the area can be generally less stable. These areas could well be the breeding grounds of blight and require the controls of zoning more than other areas. How can these edges of friction be minimized?

1. Through transition zoning that permits such uses as doctor's offices, controlled parking area or low density multi-family dwellings for a limited distance between dissimilar zones.
2. Through a transition zone that makes for more open space brought about by greater yard width standards where such zones abut.
3. Through the transition of height, by permitting a height limit that is an intermediate standard between the heights permitted in the adjacent zones.

These methods can obviously be used in combination. They place additional restrictions on one zone, but are necessary to protect the other zone. Through minimizing adverse effects some form of stability can be achieved in land use and, in turn, land values. If this method is reasonably applied, it should be legally sustained and be beneficial to the Community.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-41-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Darnell Robinson to rezone the property located on Hammond Street between Logan and Birch (1200 Block) described as:

Lot No. 11, Block No. 4, Cadwell's Addition to the City of Lansing

from "B" one family to "D-M" multiple family dwelling district be denied.

The proposed change would create an isolated district unrelated to similar districts, i.e., this would constitute a spot zone. The change would adversely affect living conditions in the area principally through the increase of traffic and activity.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be used in accord with existing zoning.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-42-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Mary M. Gore to rezone a parcel at 628 West St. Joseph Street from "D" apartment to "F" commercial district be denied.

This change would create a "spot zone" not in harmony with the surrounding zoning or land use.

The lot size, 33 ft. x 88 ft., and the building coverage, does not allow any off-street parking on the lot.

The Central City Plan shows this area as being proposed for high density multiple dwelling, which is compatible with the existing zoning.

Any commercial activity at this corner would conflict with the flow of traffic. Subject parcel lies along the north side of St. Joseph with an interchange down ramp only a few feet to the west.

The Secretary called the Board's attention to the fact that the subject parcel lies along the north side of St. Joseph with an interchange down ramp only a few feet to the west.

Mr. Manz stated that the Board should not recommend any construction near an interchange.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-43-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Reynolds that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Velma L. Skinner to rezone a parcel at 712 North Pine Street described as:

Lot 9 except the North 29 feet of the West 99 feet, Block F of Subdivision of Blocks 26 and 27 of Original Plat of City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "C" two family district to "J" parking district be denied as filed and that the

East 66 feet of Lot 9, Block F of Subdivision of Blocks 26 and 27 of Original Plat, City of Lansing

be rezoned from "C" two family district to "J" parking

and the balance of the request

remain in its present zoning classification.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as high density residential (10 and 20 dwelling units per acre). The change of zoning would allow a density out of character with the surrounding area and the Master Plan.

The denial of that portion of land extending west to Pine Street would in effect, help to control the density in this case and prohibit over development of the land.

Recent studies and proposed amendments to the existing zoning ordinance, if in effect, would discourage over development of this site.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-44-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Seibert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Valeria Q., Boyd L. and Richard W. Lewis to rezone a parcel at 912 West St. Joseph Street described as

Lots 18 and 19 and the West 73.5 feet of Lot 20, also north 48 feet of East ½ of Lot 17, Bush, Butler and Sparrow Addition

from "F-1" commercial district to "G-2" wholesale district be denied, but recommends that

Lot 19, Bush, Butler, and Sparrow Addition

be rezoned from "C" two family to "F" commercial district.

This will provide the entire block, between Butler and Logan, facing St. Joseph Street for commercial relocation resulting from I-496 construction.

The Master Land Use Plan shows a commercial center in this vicinity.

The trucking operation, for which the rezoning is requested, would introduce a use which is contrary to the surrounding land use. The "G-2" wholesale district would be a "spot zone" not consistent with the existing or proposed zoning pattern for the area north of I-496.

The Board strongly urges that this block be designated as specific commercial relocation area and that other mixed use requests, such as "G-2" wholesale, be discouraged due to its incompatibility of land uses. A trucking terminal and temporary refuse collection storage area such as proposed would have a deteriorating and blighting effect on the proposed upgrading of the area.

Mr. Reynolds asked if the Board had given any thought as to where they could locate.

The Secretary advised that a site was rezoned for them near Birch Street on Logan, as per an earlier request.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert.—8

Nays: None.

Z-45-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Dr. Robert Goodman to rezone a parcel at 3200 North Grand River from "C" two family to "D" apartment district be denied.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as low density residential. The basic land use conditions have not changed in the area.

The uses allowed in the "D" apartment district are contrary to the existing and proposed land use of this area. Any expansion of the existing use would adversely affect the adjacent properties, principally through the increase of traffic and activity. This change would constitute a grant of a special privilege to an individual as contrasted to the general welfare.

Any further change of zoning on this site would make it difficult to control any future requests for a more intensive use in the area, as a result the entire character of the area could change.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert.—8

Nays: None.

Z-46-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that

the petition by H. Paul Koepke, Jr. of Shell Oil Company to rezone a parcel at 1018—1015 West Main Street described as

Lot 69 Assessor's Plat No. 3, City of Lansing, Michigan

from "C" two family to "F" commercial district be denied as filed and that

The East 5 feet of the property

be rezoned from "C" two family to "J" parking and

the balance of the property

be rezoned from "C" two family to "F" commercial district with screening along the east property line except for a 25 foot setback on Main Street. Screening to consist of one of the following:

A redwood or cedar louvered fence 5 feet in height with boards running perpendicular to the ground.

A 3 foot high cyclone type fence with dense evergreen planting of a mature height of 5 feet in height.

Screening to be constructed and maintained until such time as the existing residential is changed.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as industrial. There are mixed commercial uses in the area, some of which are non-conforming. Much of the residential use in this area is in transition.

This additional land will allow the proposed service station to set back from the street ROW and in turn, open the site distance and street ROW at this major intersection.

Mr. Manz asked who is going to park on a 5 foot strip, and was advised that this was zoned as such for screening.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert.—8.

Nays: None.

Z-47-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Manz that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Mr. and Mrs. Versel Case, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Paul R. Rodocker, and Mr. and Mrs. Harold Bodine, as represented by Leo A. Farhat, to rezone a parcel at 2405 East Mt. Hope Avenue from "A" one family district to "D-1" professional offices be denied.

The Master Land Use Plan designates this area for Park and recreation use.

At the present time public improvements, storm and sanitary sewers, and public

water are not available. Petitions have not been filed for, nor are the utilities included in the Capital Improvements Program.

The "D-1" professional offices district would permit a high density use not easily serviceable or in harmony with the surrounding low density development.

This change would constitute a grant of a special privilege to an individual as contrasted to the general welfare.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-48-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Forsberg & Gibbons Realty and Mr. and Mrs. Robert C. Forsberg, represented by Mr. Leo A. Farhat, to rezone a parcel at 2501 East Mt. Hope Avenue from "A" one family district to "D-1" professional district be denied.

The Master Land Use Plan designates this area for park and recreation use.

At the present time public improvements are not available for the area and they are not included in the Capital Improvements Program.

The "D-1" professional office district would permit a high density use not in harmony with the surrounding low density development.

This change would constitute a grant of a special privilege as contrasted to the general welfare.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-49-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Forsberg and Gibbons Realty and Mr. and Mrs. Robert C. Forsberg, represented by Mr. Leo A. Farhat, to rezone a parcel in the 2500 Block of East Mt. Hope Avenue described as:

Private Road "A" (said road running along the East boundary of Lots Thirty Three (33) and Thirty Nine (39), ALSO Lots Numbered Twenty Five (25), Twenty Six (26), Twenty Seven (27), Twenty Nine (29), Thirty Nine (39) and Lot Numbered Thirty

Four (34), EXCEPT the S. 200 ft. of the E. 118.0 feet of Said Lot Number Thirty Four (34) and EXCEPT the W. 80 feet of the South 200 feet of said Lot Number 34, of Supervisor's Plat of Fidelity Farms, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan; ALSO that portion described as Private Road A, which is 66 feet by 627 feet from a point of Mt. Hope Road north to a point connecting Lot 29 and 39 of Supervisor's Plat of Fidelity Farms

from "A" one family district to "D-M" multiple district be denied.

The Master Land Use Plan designates this area for parks and recreation use.

At the present time public improvements are not available for this area and are not included in the Capital Improvements Program. Utility capacities should be adequate to handle not only the increase in density of one particular parcel, but have the capacity to handle the increase of all other similar parcels of land were to be allowed the same privilege.

The "D-M" multiple dwelling district would permit a high density (presently 1000 square feet minimum per unit) use on a parcel of land located in an area of low density development.

The inclusion of land within the 1947 flood plain, for future multiple type development is against all planning principles for the desirable development in the best interest of the community.

Change of zoning to a higher density development of the land would create the need for at least an elementary school in the area.

Increased density would increase the traffic load on Mt. Hope Avenue.

This site does not meet the criteria for outlying apartments of being within easy walking distance of a shopping center.

Mr. Reynolds mentioned that there is a rezoning every month in this area, and wondered if any decision had been made on this area as yet.

Mr. Heino advised that the Capital Improvements Program has a project proposed in this area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-50-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by J. G. and R. Doyle and L. A. and V. Farhat to rezone a parcel at 824

North Pine Street from "C" two family district to "D-M" multiple district be denied.

The change as requested would be contrary to the Master Land Use Plan and the established land use.

The change would create an isolated district unrelated to similar districts, i.e., this would be a spot zone, and would adversely influence living conditions in the immediate area, principally through the increase of traffic and activity.

A change of zoning would constitute the grant of a special privilege to an individual as contrasted to the general welfare. The lot is of adequate size for a two-family dwelling which the Board believes allows reasonable use of the land.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-51-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Gerld and Martha Kleinhenn, Sr. to rezone a parcel in the 6400 Block of Rosedale Road described as:

The North 80 feet of Lot No. 19, Supervisor's Plat of Elmwood Farms, a subdivision of the E. ½ of the N.W. ¼ of Section 9, T3N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one family to "C" two family district be denied.

This property and the adjacent properties north and south have the necessary depth and width for possible replatting into several lots. The division and platting of land in this area has created lots of extreme width and depth. Steps should be taken to encourage replatting wherever possible.

The change would be contrary to the established land use pattern and zoning i.e., this would create a spot zone. There is no substantial reason why the property cannot be developed in accord with the existing regulations.

The granting of this request would lead to additional requests in the area and would eventually change the character of the single family district.

The change would constitute the grant of a special privilege to an individual as contrasted to the general welfare.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-52-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by the Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox Church to rezone a parcel at the N.E. corner of South Washington and Elm Street and 109 and 113 East Elm Street described as:

The South 3½ Rods of Lots 8 and 9 of Block 199, Original Plat, City of Lansing; and the West ½ of Lot No. 10, Block N. 199, Original Plat, City of Lansing

from "F" Commercial and "J" parking to "F-1" commercial and "J" parking district be denied as filed and that

The South 3½ rods of Lot 8

be rezoned from "F" commercial to "F-1" commercial.

The south 3½ rods of Lot 9

be rezoned from "F" commercial to "J" parking and

The West ½ of Lot 10

be rezoned from "D" apartment to "J" parking.

Screening to be provided along the East and most Northerly line of the "J" parking district, except for a 20 foot setback on Elm Street.

Screening to consist of one of the following:

1. A 5 foot high dense privet hedge.
2. A 3 foot high chain link fence with dense evergreen plantings of a mature height of 5 feet to 5 feet 6 inches in height.

Lighting to be provided on the parking area to a minimum of 2/10 lumens per square foot so directed so as not to affect adjacent properties or passing motorists.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as commercial. The property is located at the intersection of two streets and the yard requirements in the "F" commercial district limits any new development on the site to a narrow width. The development to the north and south of this site, fronting on Washington Avenue, is constructed without any front yard setbacks.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds, Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-53-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that

the petition by the Sisters of Mercy St. Lawrence Hospital represented by W. W. Westfall to rezone a parcel at 1210 West Saginaw Street described as:

Lots 9 and 10 Assessors Plat 14, also Lot 89 Oakdale Addition; also the balance of Lot 6, Assessors Plat 14 except portion com. S.E. corner of Lot 6, N. 115.5 ft., W. 44 ft., S. 115.5 ft., E. 44 ft. to S.E. corner and portion of Rose Ct.

from "B" one family and "F" commercial district to "D" apartment and "J" parking be granted as filed except that

The North 50 ft. of Lots 9 and 10

remain in its present zoning classification.

Low dense evergreen plantings be provided along the south line of Lot 89 except for access points.

Lighting to be provided on the parking area at a minimum of 2/10 lumens per square foot so directed so as not to affect adjacent properties or passing motorists.

The Board further recommends that the hospital authorities be notified regarding the screening requirements that were to be provided along Clayton Street under a previous zoning request.

The Master Land Use plan indicates this site as a semi-public use. Any major structural alterations or additions to the existing use is limited under the non-conforming status. The request for "J" parking will permit development of organized off-street parking and help to alleviate parking and traffic flow in the area.

When Oakland Avenue west of Logan Street is incorporated into the Lansing Trunkline Plan, the subject property will lie between two primary thoroughfares, which will provide better circulation around the area, and will reduce the affect on the residential area to the north.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-54-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Manz that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Vincent Bartos to rezone a parcel at 811 Fred Street from "A" one family district to "C" two family district be granted.

Changes of zoning in this area have created a spot zone with the subject property. The present district boundaries are illogically drawn in relation to the existing conditions.

Because of past zoning changes in the area, it would be unreasonable to deny the request.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-55-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Marvin Lieberman, Leeland Steel and Iron Co. to rezone a parcel at 929 Banghart Street from "B" one family residence to "G-2" wholesale district be granted.

The site requested for rezoning is within the area proposed for industrial expansion as shown on the Master Land Use Plan.

The Board does not believe the proposed change will have any adverse affect on the existing residential development in the area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-56-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Robert T. Dutcher, Trustee for the First Methodist Church to rezone a parcel in the 3800 block of Delta River Drive described as:

The South 100 ft. of North 383 ft. of that part of the S.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Lansing Township, T4N, R2W, Comm. 50 ft. East of the West $\frac{1}{4}$ post, Section 6, T4N, R2W, thence South 783 feet, thence Easterly 274 ft. parallel to E. and W. $\frac{1}{4}$ line thence N. 783 ft. thence Westerly 274 ft. to beg.

from "J" parking to "B" residence district be granted except that

The East 10 feet

remain "J" parking and screening as previously required be provided along the east property line.

The Board does not believe the change will adversely affect adjacent properties and adequate parking area will be available after the change of zoning.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-57-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Lansing General Hospital (Osteopathic) to rezone a parcel in the 2800 block Devonshire described as:

That part of the southwest $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 27, T4N, R2W, Lansing Township, Ingham County, Michigan lying east of the M.C.R.R. described as: Beginning at a point on the East and West one-quarter line of said Section 27, 1859.5 ft. east of the west one-quarter post of said Section 27, said point of beginning also being the northeast corner of Central Warehousing Plat; thence South 790.7 ft. along the E. line of said plat; thence on a bearing of South $16^{\circ} 45'$ east 381.4 ft. along the east side of said plat to the southeast corner of said plat; thence east 685.3 ft.; thence north 111.7 ft. more or less to the east and west one-quarter line of said Section 27; thence west along said one-quarter line 779 ft. to the point of beginning, containing 20 acres of land more or less

from "A" one family to "D" apartment district be denied as filed and that the

Northerly 60 ft.; the easterly 150 ft. and the southerly 300 ft. and the westerly 125 ft.

be rezoned from "A" one family to "J" parking district.

and the balance of the property

be rezoned from "A" one family to "D" apartment district.

Because of the existing use of this property and the vacant area available for expansion, it would be desirable to make this a conforming use.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-58-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Stanley Stelmashenko to rezone a parcel in the 2500 blk. Linlawn described as:

Beginning at the Southeast corner of Lot 37 of Prairie Village Subdivision of the City of Lansing, Michigan which is part of the S.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 27, T4N, R2W, Ingham County, Michigan, then S. $89^{\circ} 22' 30''$ E. 164.25 ft., then N. $16^{\circ} 25'$ W. 425.27 ft., then S. $89^{\circ} 34'$ W. 1.97 ft., to the East side of Linlawn Avenue, then S. $0^{\circ} 08' 16''$ W. along said Linlawn Ave.

298.0 ft. to the South edge of Greenlawn Ave. then S. $89^{\circ} 34'$ W. 39.0 ft. to the Northeast corner of said Lot 37, then S. $0^{\circ} 08' 15''$ W. 107.70 ft. to the point of beginning

and

Beginning at the Northeast corner of Lot 12 of the Prairie Village Subdivision, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan which is part of the S.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 27, T4N, R2W, thence S. $0^{\circ} 08' 15''$ W. 99.0 ft. then N. $89^{\circ} 34'$ E. 40.97 ft. then N. $16^{\circ} 25'$ W. 103.30 ft. then S. $89^{\circ} 34'$ W. 10.72 ft. to the point of beginning.

from "I" heavy industrial district to "D-M" multiple district be denied and further recommend that the property be rezoned to "C" two family district.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as medium density residential. The change of zoning to "D-M" would allow development contrary to the existing land use and would adversely effect living conditions in the immediate area, principally through the increase of traffic and activity. The site does not meet the following criteria that should apply for apartment zoning:

On or close to an intersection of a major thoroughfare.

Within easy walking distance of a shopping center.

Strategically located in relation to centers of employment and the Central Business District.

Utility capacity that can handle the increase in density. The existing sewers that would serve the proposed development are a combination of sanitary and storm and only three feet below grade and are not adequate. Because of the sewer situation any new development would have to exclude basements.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-59-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Manz that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Charles H. Seyfert to rezone a parcel at 827 E. Michigan Avenue described as: (amended)

Lot 4, Block 1, Jerome's Addition

from "F" commercial to "G-2" wholesale be granted.

The existing manufacturing operation east of this site is a nonconforming use, which limits any major improvements on

the premises. The owners of the potato chip manufacturing operation plan to use the property in question to improve their loading and unloading facilities.

The Board does not believe the change will have any adverse affect. The property is presently zoned "F" commercial. The "G-2" wholesale district does not allow a degree of intensity that would be contrary to the established land use. Yard requirements are the same as the "F" commercial district.

The encroachment of the existing non-conforming use to the east, makes it difficult to develop this parcel in accord with the existing regulations.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-60-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Petition by Keith B. Granger and Dr. Edw. Reynolds to rezone a parcel at 5334 S. Cedar Street from "D" apartment to "F" commercial be tabled until May 24th as requested by the petitioner to allow them to redraw the parking lot and also relocate the T.B.A. building on the property.

Motion carried by unanimous vote:

Z-61-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the petition by Robert Refior and Keith Granger to rezone property in the 700-800 blocks of N. Armstrong Road described as:

Lots 1 through 12 inclusive of Penn.-Cedar Subdivision

from "A" one family to "D" apartment district be tabled until May 24th.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-62-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the petition by Robert Refior and Keith Granger to rezone a parcel in the 700-800 block Armstrong Rd. N. described as:

Lots 13 through 24 inclusive of Penn.-Cedar Subdivision

from "A" one family to "D" apartment district be tabled until May 24th

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-69-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Manz that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Adams Potato Chips, Inc. as represented by Ronald C. Morgan to rezone a parcel at 826 Jerome St. described as:

Lot 7, Block 1, Jerome's Addition to the City of Lansing, except the E. 8.25 ft. of the North 115.5 ft. thereof

from "D-M" multiple district to "J" parking district be granted with screening along the east boundary of the "J" parking district except for a 20 ft. setback on Jerome Street.

Screening to consist of one of the following:

A dense privet hedge 6 ft. in height.

A 3 ft. high chain link fence with dense evergreen plantings of a mature height of five feet six inches in height.

Lighting to be provided on the parking area of a minimum of 2/10 lumens per square foot so directed so as not to affect adjacent properties or passing motorists.

The existing manufacturing operation east of this site is a nonconforming use, which limits any major improvements on the premises. The owners of the potato chip manufacturing operation plan to use the property in question to improve their loading and unloading facilities.

The Board does not believe the change will have any adverse affect. The property is presently zoned "F" commercial. The "G-2" wholesale district does not allow a degree of intensity that would be contrary to the established land use. Yard requirements are the same as the "F" commercial district.

The encroachment of the existing non-conforming use to the East, makes it difficult to develop this parcel in accord with the existing regulations.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-77-66

Motion by Manz, seconded by Gaus that the Rules of Procedure be suspended so that this zoning case might be considered at this time.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Reynolds that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Ralph Oppen as agent

for Paul M. Jelinak to rezone a parcel in the 3200 block of South Pennsylvania described as:

Lots 3, 4, 5 of Walter Neller Company's Professional and Business Mart, City of Lansing, County of Ingham, State of Michigan

from "H" light industrial and "J" parking to "G-2" wholesale and "J" parking district be denied as filed and that

The South 50 ft. and the North 110 ft. of the property

be zoned "J" parking and the

Balance of the property

be zoned "G-2" wholesale district.

The proposed use will not be contrary to the established land use plan. The proposed change would not be contrary to the future land use plan. The proposed change will provide a higher ratio of off-street parking than exists at the present time.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

STREETS COMMITTEE

S-2-66

Motion by Gaus seconded by Reynolds that Mr. Gerald E. Ernst City Assessor be advised that the Preliminary Plat of Assessor's Plat No. 56 was approved subject to the following conditions:

Public improvement requirements are waived as of the Planning Board meeting of February 1, 1966.

Approval of the Preliminary Plat is effective for a maximum period of twelve months.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

S-7-62F12

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds that the Board notify City Council that they approved the Final Plat of Groesbeck Hills No. 12 and the Board recommends that it be approved by City Council subject to the following conditions:

All public improvements shall be installed with complete public utilities including water, sanitary sewers, storm sewers and

full street improvements including street paving, curb and gutter, sidewalks and such other improvements as required under Section VI D of Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

The posting of financial security in the amount of:

Monument Deposit,

44 @ \$20.00\$ 880.00

Street Grade and Gravel 6,400.00

Storm and Sanitary Sewers 27,100.00

\$34,380.00

prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

All other standards and requirements of the Michigan State Plat Act, Act 172, Public Act of 1929, as amended, shall apply.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

S-3-66P

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz that a public hearing be scheduled for the preliminary plat of Cushion Replat submitted by Mr. Larry Cushion for the use of property at 1804-1904 Massachusetts Avenue and 1801-1804 Vermont Avenue on Tuesday, May 24, 1966 at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1, Sixth Floor of City Hall.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

SS-21-64

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds that the Board recommend to City Council that they considered the realignment of Waverly Road at North Grand River Avenue and recommend that the proposed relocation of Waverly Road as recommended by the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission Technical Committee be approved and that a minimum right-of-way of 100 feet be acquired by the city to provide for such relocation.

The Board further recommends that upon completion of the realignment, the city authorize the closure for its portion of Waverly Road where it presently intersects North Grand River and that consideration be given to the development of a limited access facility along the realignment route.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

ROW-10-66

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds that the Board recommend to City Council that after considering the letter from the Builders and Traders Exchange of Lansing, Inc., requesting the abandonment of an alley located at the rear of the lot at 1140 E. Saginaw St., that the alley be vacated.

The alley is unimproved and extends S. of Lot No. 1 with a width of 49.5 ft. and a depth of 20 ft. It has no outlet to any public right-of-way. All interested city departments approve the vacation as it is isolated and it does not seem reasonable to assume that it would ever be improved.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

BUILDINGS AND PROPERTIES

BP-10-66 and BP-11-66

Both these parking ramp garages have been approved by the Board as to location. City Council will submit the plans to the Board for their approval.

ORDINANCE

Mr. Black reported that the Ordinance Committee meeting will be held after the comments from the Board members are received.

PLANNING DIRECTORS REPORT

The Secretary advised the Board that the Michigan Society of Planning Officials will be holding a conference at the Pantlind Hotel May 11 thru 13th and urged as many members as possible to attend.

The Secretary further requested authorization for staff members to attend the conference with the city paying for registration and meals.

Motion by Manz, seconded by Bretz that four members of the staff be allowed to attend the MSPO meeting in Grand Rapids.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Secretary advised that at the mid-month meeting he would like to cover the highlights of the Philadelphia Conference.

The Secretary further advised that for the mid-month meeting he will try to obtain a film "No Time for Ugliness" produced by the American Institute of Architects.

The Secretary advised that the status report of the Central Core Study will be deferred to the mid-month meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 12:15 A.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

T/C

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, June 7, 1966

Meeting was called to order by Chairman Russell Fink at 7:40 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Absent: Manz.

HEARINGS

Zonings

Z-82-66

Mr. John A. Tysman, President of the Estate Property Purchasers Investors, Co., Inc., appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 3000 block of Aurelius Road described as:

West 136.6 feet of Lot 3 of Supervisors Plat of Robinson Road Subd., and the West 136.6 feet of Lot 4 of Supervisors Plat of Robinson Road Subd.

from "A" one family residential to "C" two family residence district. Mr. Tysman presented pictures of the area. He advised that the extension of Aurelius was a prime factor in requesting the multiple family. This is mostly vacant land with smaller, somewhat deteriorating homes.

Mr. Fink asked if he proposed four units and was advised that he did.

Mr. Siebert asked for clarification if this were to be multiple or "C" two family, and was advised that it was to be for two family.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-83-66

Mr. William C. Hines, Real Estate Representative for Sun Oil Company appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property on the S.E. corner of E. Kalamazoo and Clifford described as:

Lot 23 and 24, Clears Subd., except commencing at the N.E. corner of said

Lot 24, Clears Subd., East 50 feet, Southwesterly 2.10 feet South of the N.W. corner of said Lot 24

from "B" one family residence to "E" district and stated that in 1965 they petitioned to change the nonconforming use to allow a service station and it was denied. The station has been abandoned because they are unable to find a lessee. They are requesting this so they can either use the present building, modernize or tear it down.

Mr. Reynolds asked if they were denied the rezoning and was advised in the affirmative. The petitioner wanted to use this site for the sale of cars and the repair of automobiles.

Mr. Fink asked if the zoning were "E-2" at that time and Mr. Hines replied that he did not know.

Mr. Fink asked if all the equipment is out, and was informed that it has all been removed.

Some discussion was held on the permitted uses in the "E" classification.

Mr. Hines indicted that he thought it could be used for a real estate office, a doughnut shop, etc.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-84-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 3313 W. Mt. Hope Avenue from "A" one family residence to "D-M" multiple dwelling district. In view of the fact that the petitioner was involved in a funeral this afternoon, the staff are to accept any testimony offered.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-85-66

Mr. Adolph R. Frantz appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 5249 N. Grand River Avenue from "A" one family residence to "F" commercial district and stated he wanted to develop a

mobile trailer park. He presented the petition now, because some councilmen have stated that he had not filed a petition. This property is ideal for a mobile home park and he feels that to disallow this will be discriminatory. He has been in the mobile home business for 20 years. The Michigan State Highway Department has purchased his park and his tenants are moving to non-parks because there are none available. Mr. Frantz then asked if the Mobile Home Trailer Park ordinance had been passed by Council and was advised that it had not to their knowledge. Mr. Frantz then informed the Board of the meeting he had with the mayor's assistant and Mr. Brown of the Planning staff on the city taking part of his property for a highway. He stated he would like to use the rest of the area for his mobile home park. If his rezoning is not granted, the City might expect some trouble in obtaining the land for the highway.

Mr. Reynolds asked if the petitioner had a place he could go if this is not rezoned. Mr. Frantz stated that he has owned the property for 15 years and feels that it is discriminatory to insist that mobile homes must be next to a factory. He expects to house 250 families. He would like to get a release on the zoning for the shopping center. He feels that it should be brought out in the open inasmuch as the sewers are on their way in.

Mr. Black stated that he was disturbed by Mr. Frantz's remark relative to the City obtaining land for the highway.

Mr. Frantz stated that the City would like the roadway very much. He would like the mobile housing. He feels that it is fair that he should be given some consideration when they are going to put in a road in the middle of his proposed shopping center.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-86-66

Mr. Don Chase appeared for Charles and Una Joseph in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 701 W. Mt. Hope from "I" commercial and "J" parking to "D" apartment district and reported that there is a two story frame building built in 1919. The downstairs has been used as commercial since that time. He presented pictures of the area. Their reason for asking the rezoning is that they would like to put an apartment building on the S.W. side of this property making visibility much clearer and much more presentable than it is now. He presented a sketch of the type of building.

Mr. Fink asked if they had a rent schedule, and was advised that there is none at present.

Mr. Black remarked that it appears on the site plans that the building will be set

inside pavement. There will be pavement on three sides. The petitioner should present revised site plans showing necessary open space and the area for parking.

Some discussion was held on the types of plans needed and the landscaping.

Mr. Chase asked how soon the plans would be needed and Mr. Fink suggested that they be submitted by the 20th of this month.

Mr. Black stated that he had no intention of delaying the matters, but it seems like the whole thing would be paved except a 7 ft. strip.

The plans were returned to Mr. Chase.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-87-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 1107-09 Seymour Avenue from "C" two family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-88-66

Mr. Bud Brown, representing Granger Construction Co. appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 3000 block of N. East Street (U.S. 27) described as:

Lots 7 through 16 inclusive of the Elmore M. Hunt Subdivision. A portion of the South $\frac{1}{2}$ of the S.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 3, T4N, R2W, Lansing Township, Ingham County, Michigan

from "F" Commercial and "J" parking to "F" commercial district. They are requesting enough area so that canopies and marquees can be installed to make the building presentable. The building will be 100 feet wide, and they are asking for 130 feet. The building will be set to the back of the property. The back corner and one side will be used for parking.

Mr. Siebert asked the floor space and was advised 12,000 sq. ft.

Mr. Fink asked the size of the building and was advised that the present structure which is 40 x 90 will be cleared from the property. The house is already removed. The entire lot will be blacktopped except for the building and the sidewalk.

Mr. Siebert asked the amount of parking spaces and was advised they will present a plat plan and will have one car space for each 100 ft. of building. They will have about $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 3 ratio.

Mrs. Bretz asked the type of shop and was advised that it will be a Shop Rite Supermarket, in a new location.

Mr. Fink asked if the relocation is necessary because of the widening of the street and was advised that was correct. The present store has been there for years.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-89-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property between 1705 and 1725 Comfort Street described as:

Front 173.25 ft. of Lot 31, Assessor's Plat 1, City of Lansing

from "A" one family residential to "J" parking district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-90-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 1319 W. Michigan Avenue from "B" one family residence to "C" two family residence district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-91-66

Mr. H. Paul Koepke, representing Shell Oil Company appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 612 S. Pine and 612 and 608 W. St. Joseph Street from "C" two family to "F" commercial district and stated that the N.W. corner was operated by an independent service station. This is much too small for their need. They currently have the service station under option. This will open up this corner, which will have heavy swing traffic. There will be an overpass at this point to Oldsmobile. Their service station will be set back. The property will be cleared and enhanced. The property adjacent has nine apartment units, and to the north there are two or three family apartment units.

Mr. Fink asked if Pine is egress to Oldsmobile and was informed that it will be at Sycamore, west of this property.

Some discussion was held on the placement of the ramps.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-92-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 6065 S.

Washington Avenue from "J" parking to "F" commercial district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-93-66

Mr. Keith D. Hamilton appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 5436 S. Cedar Street from "F" commercial to "H" light industrial district. He is operating a car sales and auto repair service. He has several times requested light industrial. He has been in business there for 10 years. To the south of him is zoned light industrial.

Mr. Reynolds asked if he used the front yard for auto sales, Mr. Hamilton stated he was back from the highway about 30 ft. He would like to keep building where his home is now.

Mr. Gaus asked if the repair shop is zoned properly and was advised that it is not.

Mr. Reynolds remarked that there is quite a bit in back that is not being asked for rezoning. Mr. Hamilton stated he would like to get the whole thing rezoned.

Mr. Hamilton was asked to submit his plans to the staff.

Mr. Reynolds asked if on the south side, he was close to "A" one family and Mr. Hamilton replied that he owns the property. There is one piece about 45 ft. of "F" commercial and this is the only thing between he and Redner Road.

Mr. Reynolds asked if the owner to the south is still favorable and Mr. Hamilton stated he had never received any opposition.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-94-66

Mr. Russell Lawler, attorney appeared for James and Mary O'Laughlin in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 6026 S. Logan Street from "A" residential to "G-2" wholesale district and advised that the petitioners purchased this property approximately four years ago. A building was on the Northerly portion of the property that they immediately transferred and put into a commercial building. This was outside the city. Two years ago they constructed a warehouse on the westerly portion of the property, immediately prior to annexation. At the present time this property is being occupied by a tree service. On the parcel to the south (45 ft. x 105 ft.) is a gas storage tank above ground. At the time this was installed it was zoned commercial. In 1965 the Fire Marshall told them they had to get the gas tank below ground. A building permit cannot be ob-

tained. The area to the south is zoned residential. It is strictly commercial to the North and there are very few homes. The school area is fenced in to eliminate children crossing the street.

Mrs. Bretz asked if the tank is a warehouse operation and was advised that it is.

Mr. Reynolds asked if the storage tank is for their use only and Mr. Lawler stated that the tree service is of average size, and they are the sole users.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-95-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 729 N. Cedar Street from "C" two family to "H" light industrial district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-96-66

Mr. Mitchel M. Skory appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 905 Cleveland Street from "B" one family residential to "F" commercial district and questioned whether or not this property was zoned commercial. He advised that he would like to remove a house and add on to the back of the building and also to provide off street parking. He has a parking problem and parking in front is a hazard with the heavy traffic of Oakland Street. The addition will be put on back of 901. Front would be parking at 905. With the new addition, the building will be "L" shaped.

Mr. Fink asked the petitioner to check with the staff on the site sketch.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-97-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 2923 N. East Street and vacant north and adjacent to said first property described as:

The North 42 ft. of Lot 2, Supervisor's Plat of Community Homes Sites, Lansing Township, Ingham County, Michigan. All that part of Lot 3 of Supervisor's Plat of Community Home Sites of a part of the S.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the N.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 4, T4N, R2W, Lansing Township, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one family residence to "F" commercial district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-98-66

Mr. Harry Feguer appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 3300 block of W. Holmes Road from "A" one family to "C" two family residence district. Mr. Feguer advised that immediately to the east of this property is a one family dwelling on about an acre of ground. The petitioner told of the use of the surrounding area. He desires to have this rezoned to "C" two family.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-99-66

Mr. Edward Benson appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 6046 and 6030 S. Logan Street from "A" one family residential to "G-2" wholesale district and mentioned that the property mentioned in the zoning petition Z-40-66 is next to this property. Mr. Benson stated that he has been at this location for the past 12 or 13 years and wants to be put back to commercial from "A" one family. The present use is a warehouse and office, for the storing of motor oil. He told of the uses in the area.

Mr. Siebert asked what was north of his station and was advised that it is a warehouse used for rental laundry equipment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-100-66

Mr. A. Z. Breen appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 5000 block of S. Pennsylvania Avenue described as:

Lots 33 and 34 of Pleasant Ridge Subd.

from "C" two family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district and stated that he has had a number of calls on this property for multiple family. He would like to rezone so that it can be sold.

Mr. Siebert asked how long this property had been zoned "C" two family with no structures, and Mr. Breen replied about two years. He had no plans as he wanted it zoned commercial. This was the best they would give him at that time.

Mr. Gaus asked if directly across the street was "D-M" multiple and was advised that it is not.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-101-66

Mr. William C. Hines representing Sun Oil Company appeared in behalf of the

petition to rezone property at 5100 S. Pennsylvania Avenue from "A" one family to "F" commercial district. Mr. Hines stated that approximately 6 years ago this was purchased by Sun Oil. It was zoned suitable for a service station at that time. It was developed into a two bay service station. Recently it was found to be non-conforming along with another business, the sale of boats which is also on the site. They thought the area would grow faster than it did. The operator needs to supplement. Present operator has been there one year. The hours of operation are 9:00 to 9:00 during the boat season and the rest of the year Monday through Saturday from 9:00 to 6:00 and Sunday from 2:00 to 6:00. The site is large enough so as not to create a traffic hazard. The other stations in the area are closed. They are asking consideration for the "F" so that the operator can carry on the two businesses.

Mr. George Borger, Tenant, stated that he was requesting that the change be granted and extended an invitation to the Board to question the type of operation that he has.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-102-66

Mr. Robert W. Smith of the architectural firm of Smith and Freeman appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 900 N. Capitol Avenue from "D-M" multiple dwelling to "D-1" professional Offices District. Mr. Smith advised that there is a residence here now. It is well constructed, in excellent repair and has been there for many years. It is well landscaped. Mr. Smith told of the buildings in the area.

Mr. Fink asked if this would be a relocation of their complete offices and Mr. Smith replied that it would be.

Mr. Siebert asked the number of employees and was advised they have five. They will have parking for their cars and customers' without parking on the front lawn. They will provide parking for six cars plus garage. A site plan was shown to the Board.

Mr. Fink called attention to the fact that the garage was considered one parking space. Each parking space must be accessible.

Mr. Black asked if they had tried to obtain any place along Washington Avenue already zoned for this type of operation. Mr. Smith stated that most of these are established businesses and older homes.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-103-66

Mr. Clark R. Ackley, Architect, appeared in behalf of the petition by St. Michael's Episcopal Church for the rezoning of the property at 2709 Eifert Road from "A" one family to "B" one family residence district. Mr. Ackley stated the purpose of the zoning request is to place the zoning in line with what is already started on the site. The Building was started in 1959 and this is the first step in the expansion needed by the church at the present time.

This land is deed restricted for the church. They wish to continue the proposed program as far as church construction is concerned.

Mr. Black asked what Mr. Neller had proposed to do with this property in his development.

Mr. Fink relied this was an exception parcel in the plan.

Mr. Black then asked what were the recommendation of Johnson, Johnson, and Roy.

Mr. Ackley replied that Mr. Neller proposed moving the church, however, his proposal was not satisfactory. They have held it open for two years. Because of the congregational need, something must now be done. They need about 4,000 sq. ft. This will improve the appearance of the building which is not "too churchy" at present.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-104-66

Mr. Velmer Croteau appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 1201 N. Larch Street from "F" commercial to "H" light Industrial district and reported that he purchased the property last fall from an oil company under the idea he could use the body shop. This spring the fire inspector told him it should be rezoned.

Mr. Siebert asked if this were an abandoned gas station and was advised that it was. It had been used by two new car dealers for a body shop until he purchased it.

Mr. Siebert asked the type of work he did and was informed that they do all kinds, but mostly spraying.

Mr. Gaus asked if the front was used for a used car sales, and was advised that it was.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-105-66

Mr. Mel Thompson, part owner of the Medical Dental Building, appeared in be-

half of the petition to rezone the property at 725 and 729 N. Logan and 1118 Rose Court from "B" one family residence to "J" parking district. Mr. Thompson advised that these parcels were acquired with the medical dental building. They intended to buy all the property in Rose Court, but find they cannot due to the cost. There is one private owner on this side. This parking area was recommended at the time they obtained their building permit. Three older homes will be torn down in September, with their scheduled leases, will need this area for parking. The street is dead ended. St. Lawrence Hospital owns West of their property.

Mr. Fink asked if Rose Court is an egress to the parking lot and was advised that it is not.

Mr. Reynolds asked if they wanted Rose Court closed and Mr. Thompson stated that it is not economically feasible now, but thinks it is a logical move so that it can be used for parking.

Mr. Fred Barberio of 1114 Rose Court appeared in objection to this rezoning. He stated that he moved in three years ago and moved into a new home two months ago. His first house was sold to the Medical Dental Building. At 1118, if this is turned into a parking lot he wondered how they would get the cars in and out. He stated his concern for the children in the area. He further mentioned that Oakland-Logan turning to Saginaw area is hazardous because of the congestion.

Z-106-66

Mr. W. Prentice Peck, Business Manager of the Michigan Conference of the Evangelical United Brethern Church, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 5438 S. Pennsylvania Avenue from "A" one family residential to "D-1" professional offices district advised they are requesting the change to conform to the code. This was purchased five years ago from a heating company. It houses the business offices for the denomination for the state.

Mr. Fink asked if the offices would be retained and was advised that they would. They anticipate no change.

Mr. Fink then asked if there would be building changes and was informed that there are none in the immediate future. There are some mergers possible this fall which might create a need for more facilities.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-107-66

Mr. B. E. Brown of Granger Construction Company appeared in behalf of the

petition by the New Home Missionary Baptist Church for the rezoning of property at 3133 Pleasant Grove Road from "A" one family to "B" one family and "J" parking district and advised that this building was built in 1941. In 1948 this area was annexed to the City. In October, 1965, a fire on the premises burned the building severely. The petitioners have purchased this property and want to repair or replace it and to add a 20 by 32 foot addition to the existing structure for a pulpit and baptistry. They would like 10 feet completely around the building for entry ways and the balance for parking.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-108-66

Mr. Jay H. Raines appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 5723 S. Waverly Road from "A" one family residence to "D-M" multiple dwelling district. Mr. Raines reported that the land is high and level and would make a good buffer for the subdivision.

Mr. Gaus asked about the proposed development to the East and was informed that a public hearing will be held on the proposed Community Unit plan on Tuesday, July 5th.

Z-109-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 416 E. Grand River Avenue from "F-1" commercial to "H" light industrial district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Recess was from 9:50 to 10:15 P.M.

BUSINESS SESSION

The Chairman presented an explanation of the Zoning Process.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-75-63

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that after considering the petition by John Schell for an amendment to the Community Unit Plan of Pleasant Grove Apartments, Simken Village S.E. corner of Pleasant Grove and Holmes.

Commencing 264 feet West and 300 feet South of the North $\frac{1}{4}$ post of the Northwest $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 32, Town 4 North, Range 2 West, thence South 409.5 feet, thence west 623.8 feet to

a point 440 feet east of the west line of Section 32, thence north 347.1 feet parallel with the west line of Section 32, thence west 407 feet to the east ROW line of Pleasant Grove Road, thence north 8.3 feet to the southerly line of the old New York Central Railroad right-of-way, thence north 53° 40' east 211.4 feet along the southerly line of the old New York Central Railroad right-of-way, thence East approximately 335.53 feet, thence north 235 feet, thence east 60 feet, thence south 233 feet, thence east 134.87 feet, thence south 80.60 feet, thence east 198 feet, thence north 5.75 feet, thence east 132 feet to point of beginning

and following a period of study by the planning staff and a public hearing held on June 7, 1966 it was found that:

The adjacent property would not be adversely affected.

The plan is consistent with the intent and purpose of the zoning code to promote public health, safety, morals, and general welfare.

The buildings and structures shall be used only for community activities; therefore, the Planning Board recommends that the Community Unit Plan amendment to Pleasant Grove Apartments, Simken Village be approved subject to the following conditions:

Final approval of a plat for the entire plan.

Utility easements shall be provided as may be required by the Board of Water and Light.

Fire hydrants and alarm box shall be placed as indicated on the approved plan.

A temporary turn-around shall be constructed at the east end of the proposed street.

Screening to be provided along the property lines where they abut single family development except along the line directly to the rear of the duplex housing and east end of the plan. Such screening shall consist of either:

A three foot high chain link fence with dense evergreen planting of a mature height of four to five feet.

A four foot high decorative masonry wall, or

A four foot high privet or similar deciduous hedge, or

Any other screening as may be approved by the Planning Board.

Landscaping shall be essentially as shown on the approved plan.

Occupancy permits to be issued after the foregoing conditions have been met.

Construction to begin no later than one year from the date of storm sewer availability and building permits to be issued no later than six months from the date of storm sewer availability.

All previous conditions of approval as approved by City Council, October 7, 1963, shall apply.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds, and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-21-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that after considering the amendment to the Community Unit Plan of Carriage Hill submitted by Francis N. Fine for a parcel at 3411 East Michigan Avenue, and following a period of study by the Planning Staff, it was found that:

1. The adjacent property would not be adversely affected.

2. The plan is consistent with the intent and purpose of the zoning code to promote public health, safety, morals and general welfare.

3. The buildings and structures shall be used only for community activity, therefore,

the Planning Board recommends that the amendment for the relocation of the community building and swimming pool be approved as submitted on the revised site plan.

All previous conditions of approval, as approved by City Council, July 6, 1965, shall apply.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-155-65

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by John R. Murphy to rezone a parcel at 4903 North Grand River Avenue from "A" one family district to "H" light industrial and "D-M" multiple dwelling be denied and that:

Lots 13 and 14 of Westmont Subd.

be rezoned "E-2" drive-in shop. This will make the existing vacant gas station conforming and that:

Lots 83 and 84 of Westmont Subd.

be zoned "C" two family as a transition between the single family development on the south and the uses along Grand River.

The Board believes that this will allow reasonable use of the property without any direct encroachment into the residential area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-4-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Lena Angles, Robert H. Roether, James R. and Mary A. Thomas, Ernest A. and Treva D. Smith, and David J. Arts to rezone a parcel at 900, 904, 906, 910, 912 North Pennsylvania Avenue and 1005 Oakland Avenue from "C" two family district to "E-2" Drive-in district be denied.

The master land use plan indicated this area as medium density residential. The proposed change would be contrary to the existing land use pattern to the north and east which is predominantly residential; in a sense this would be a spot zone. The proposed change would be contrary to the future Land Use Plan.

The change will adversely affect living conditions in the immediate area, principally through the increase of traffic and activity. The change may adversely affect property values in the vicinity and may, therefore, deter the improvement or development of adjacent properties. There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot continue to be used under the existing zoning.

The property elevation in relation to Oakland Street would create a traffic hazard, with automobiles moving to and from the site and those travelling west on Oakland.

The final plans for the widening of Oakland Avenue are still under consideration. Acquisition of additional right-of-way will be necessary, therefore, the Board believes that any new development or change of zoning should be discouraged.

Accident Reports at the intersection of Oakland Avenue and Pennsylvania Avenue.

1961 Total 3

1962 Total 11

Oakland Avenue became one-way through to Center Street, September 17, 1962.

| | | |
|-------|----|------------------------|
| 1963 | 12 | Rear end collisions |
| | 1 | Left turn collision |
| | 8 | Right angle collisions |
| | 9 | Left turn collisions |
| Total | 30 | |

Building permit issued for service station on the northwest corner, January 28, 1964.

| | | |
|-------|----|------------------------|
| 1964 | 12 | Rear end collisions |
| | 7 | Left turn collisions |
| | 3 | Right angle collisions |
| | 2 | fatalities |
| | 3 | Side swipes |
| | 1 | Pedestrian |
| Total | 26 | |

Oakland became one-way through to Logan, January 31, 1965.

| | | |
|-------|----|------------------------|
| 1965 | 10 | Rear end collisions |
| | 13 | Left turn collisions |
| | 6 | Right angle collisions |
| | 4 | Side swipe collisions |
| | 2 | Right turn collisions |
| | 1 | Pedestrian |
| Total | 36 | |

| | | |
|------|-------|----------------------|
| 1966 | Total | 17 accidents to date |
|------|-------|----------------------|

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-21-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by John Turner Murphy and William R. Murphy to rezone a parcel at 1300 and 1301 Brookdale and 6911 South Cedar Street from "A" one family district to "F" commercial be denied.

The Board believes that the rezoning of this property (1.65) acres without a plan or any provision for off-street parking could lead to a haphazard type of commercial development not in the best interest of the community.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-39-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Gertrude Bloomquist, as represented by Walter O. Estes, to rezone a parcel at 4318 South Cedar Street from "A" one family residential district to "D-1" professional district be denied.

This change would permit further encroachment of a non-residential use into a residential area.

Recent development in the area has not been contrary to the existing regulations. Change of zoning will deter the improvement and development of the adjacent properties to the south and west.

This parcel of land with the adjacent properties has good possibilities of being developed into approximately six (6) residential lots which would be in keeping with development in the area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-63-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by John Sarkozi to rezone a parcel at 3425 North East Street described as:

Lots 60, 61, 82, 83 Supervisor's Plat of Schwoer's Bloomfield Farms, City of Lansing

from "A" one family residential district to "G-2" wholesale district be denied as filed and that the

East 20 feet of Lots 60 and 61

be rezoned from "A" one family to "J" parking and

The balance of Lots 60 and 61

be rezoned from "A" one family to "G-2" wholesale. Consideration of the rezoning of Lots 82 and 83 will be taken up at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Board.

The "J" parking is to be maintained in open green space with low evergreen plantings except at ingress and egress points.

This change would not be contrary to the predominant land use along this area of North East Street.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-64-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Rudolph Kwast to rezone a parcel at 1825 and 1827 South Washington Avenue from "F" commercial district to "H" light industrial district be granted.

The Board does not believe that the proposed change would adversely influence living conditions in the area.

The type of business is commercial in nature, but because of the number of employees, required an industrial classification.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-65-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by John M. Cole to rezone a parcel at 5500 South Washington Avenue from "A" one family district to "D-1" professional district be denied.

The Master Land Use plan indicates this area as residential.

This change would be contrary to the established land use pattern and would create an isolated district, ie, this would be a spot zone.

This change would also adversely influence living conditions in the area, principally through the increase of traffic and activity.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be used in accord with the existing regulations inasmuch as the basic land use conditions have not changed in this area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-66-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition as filed be denied and that the property be zoned "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

The Committee further recommends that the balance of the properties in the northern half of this block that are now zoned "C" two family be considered for "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Mr. Black asked the reason for changing to the "D-M". Why not leave it as is.

Mr. Gaus asked what objections there were to having professional offices in the "D-M" multiple areas. Mr. Fountain explained the Vilcan-Leman and Associates Central Study Plan.

Mr. Reynolds questioned where the doctors would go.

Mr. Gaus questioned with the "D-M" all around, why was the half block area on the south side left in "C" two family and it was explained to him that this appeared to be a zoning from quite some time back.

Mr. Black stated that he thought it should be denied.

Mrs. Bretz explained here committee's recommendation was to give the petitioner an answer and then set the hearing for the northern half of the block.

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus that the recommendation be amended to read "denied as filed" and the Board to consider the rezoning of the entire half block at one time.

Motion on the amendment carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

The original proposal as amended would recommend to City Council that the petition by Robert C. June, M.D. to rezone a parcel at 815, 819, West Ionia Street and 218 North Butler from "C" two family to "D-1" professional district be denied.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as high density residential and recent studies regarding zoning and development of land in this area also indicate this area for multi-family development.

Strong pressures for office development throughout this area will continue, if indiscriminate spot zoning of this nature is allowed. The proposed use would generate additional traffic into the existing residential area. The proposed development would completely surround three existing residential dwellings.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-67-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Stuart J. Dunnings, Jr., attorney for Capitol Lodge No. 8 F & AM, to rezone a parcel at 727 and 729 West Lenawee Street from "C" two family residential district to "E" apartment shop district be denied.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as high density residential and the change would create an isolated district, i.e., this would be a spot zone.

If indiscriminate spot-zoning is allowed, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to deny a similar use on an adjacent property, then the property adjacent to that and ultimately on down the street. Soon there is an intermingling of uses, thus defeating one of the basic purposes for which the zoning ordinance was developed—to implement the comprehensive plan.

Recent studies regarding zoning and development indicate this area as multi-family development.

Motion carried by the following votes:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-68-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Keith and Gail Otis to rezone a parcel at the 4300 block Aurelius and the 2000 block of Cavanaugh Road described as:

Lot No. 1 of Supervisors Plat of Culverdale, City of Lansing, County of Ingham, State of Michigan

from "A" one family residence to "F" commercial district be denied at this time.

The existing right-of-way widths on both Cavanaugh and Aurelius are 66 feet. The Master Land Use Plan indicates that the right-of-way should be increased to a minimum of 80 feet.

The Board believes that the existing size of the parcel does not lend itself to the proposed development plus the necessary right-of-way needed to bring these streets up to the proposed standards thus compounding this problem.

The land to the north was zoned for commercial development and is in keeping with the Master Land Use Plan. The use as proposed should be incorporated into this area.

The extension of Aurelius Road from Mt. Hope Avenue north to I-496 is scheduled in the Capital Improvements Program from 1966 through 1968. The completion of this route will encourage additional traffic on Aurelius Road and necessitate additional street widening and improvements on that portion now existing, therefore, the Board believes that every step should be taken to insure that adequate land is preserved for future widening and that any new development provides adequate setbacks. This is especially critical at the intersection of two major streets.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-70-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Arthur J. Hull to rezone a parcel at 1549 Knollwood Avenue from "B" one family district to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied.

This change would be contrary to the established land use pattern. The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as low density residential (4 to 10 dwelling units per net acre.)

The change of zoning would create an isolated district unrelated to similar districts, i.e., a spot zone, and would allow a use that would adversely affect property values in the area principally through the increase of traffic and activity.

The change would constitute a grant of a special privilege to an individual as contrasted to the general welfare.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-71-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to the City Council that the petition by Robert Hands to rezone a parcel at 740 Durant Street from "B" one family residential district to "C" two family residential district be denied.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as medium density residential (4 to 10 dwelling units per net acre).

The change would create an isolated district unrelated to the area, i.e., this would be a spot zone, and would be contrary to the established land use pattern.

The property falls within the path of the proposed Oakland St. extension as do many other properties in the area. A change of zoning on this parcel would prompt other individuals to seek the same privilege and the net result would be overcrowding of the land, a basic cause of deterioration.

This change would constitute a grant of a special privilege to an individual as contrasted to the general welfare.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-72-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Reynolds that the Rules of Procedure be suspended so that persons from the audience might be heard.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. James R. Butterwick of 5916 Haag Rd. appeared and stated there was a petition 6 months ago on this rezoning. He is against it. There was some discussion on the zoning in the area and what would be allowed.

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition as filed be denied and that the property be zoned "C" two family except:

Lot 92 of Yorkshire Park Subdivision No. 3 and

Lot 1 of Yorkshire Park Subdivision No. 1

Mr. Black stated that he appreciated the Committee's desire to keep Lot 92 and Lot 1 in the one family classification, but why are Lots 96 and 97 being spot zoned? Why zone these two lots when both sides are not "A" one family?

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus that the recommendation be amended to include Lots 96 and 97 also remaining in "A" one family.

Mr. Siebert explained that the owner of Lot 95 has his home on 94. A survey based on both sides and also on Lot 98, which is now vacated, finds them willing to go along with the "C" two family on Lots 96 and 97.

Mr. Black then asked if he didn't want to change it at a later date.

Motion on the amendment carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds, and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Motion on the original recommendation with the amendments, which would recommend to City Council that the petition by Sam S. Bofysil, as represented by Mr. Leo A. Farhat, to rezone a parcel in the 5900 and 6000 block of Haag and the 1600 block of West Miller Road described as:

Lots 92, 96, 97, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, and 106 of the plat of Yorkshire Park Subdivision No. 3 (formerly Delhi Township) City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan and Lot No. 1 of the plat of Yorkshire Park Subdivision No. 1 (formerly Delhi Township) City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one family residential district to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied as filed and that the property be zoned "C" two family except

Lots 92, 96, 97 of Yorkshire Park Subdivision No. 3

and

Lot No. 1 of Yorkshire Park Subdivision No. 1

which should remain in "A" one family residence district. All lots north of Kennedy Drive should remain "A" one family district.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as medium density residential (4 to 10 dwelling units per net acre).

The apartment development would abut the existing single family uses that front on Hughes Rd. Where the apartment zone abuts the single family development the single family zone is subject to adverse influences and pressures of greater population and building densities, higher and larger buildings, greater traffic, and similar factors. The residential properties may, under certain circumstances, be less desirable. Its values may be reduced and the area can be generally less stable. The edges of friction can be minimized in the following ways:

Through transition zoning that permits such uses as doctors' offices, controlled parking areas or low-density multi-family dwellings for a limited distance between dissimilar zones.

Through a transition zone that makes for more open space brought about by greater yard width standards where such zones abut.

Through the transition of height, by permitting a height limit that is an intermediate standard between the heights permitted in the adjacent zones.

The proposed change would be contrary to the established land use pattern west of Haag Road.

Carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-73-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Rellison M. and Grace Swisher, as represented by Steve Horiszny, to rezone a parcel at 2223 West Holmes Road from "A" one family residential district to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied.

The Board believes that this site could be justified for "D-M" multiple, if the proposed amendments for the "D-M" multiple district, which would allow a maximum of 17 units with two parking spaces per unit were in effect. This would promote a density that would be in keeping with the multiple projects in the vicinity.

The present code would allow a maximum of 29 units on the site, with one parking space per unit.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds, and Siebert—7

Nays: None.

Z-74-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by David Swank to rezone a parcel at 3718 South Logan Street from "J" parking district to "F" commercial district be denied.

At the present time the "J" parking district acts as a buffer between the commercial building and the residential lots to the west. The present "J" parking district allows parking in and around the site, but does not allow the petitioner maximum use of the land as intended by the code.

The rear yard requirements in the "F" commercial district, according to the Lansing Zoning Code, is 25 feet. This is considered reasonable and provides desirable open space and protection for abutting properties (in this case single family residential). In addition, the residential development should be protected against

the encroachment of commercial development.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-75-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Sam S. Bofysil, as represented by Leo A. Farhat, to rezone a parcel in the 900 block of Miller Road described as:

Lots 1, 2, and 3 of Southbrook Subdivision (formerly Delhi Twp.), City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one family district to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied as filed and the property be zoned "C" two family district

This would encourage development of the site and keep any proposed structures in harmony with the existing residential development. The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as low density residential (2 to 3 dwelling units per net acre). "D-M" multiple zoning would allow development out of character with the existing adjacent residential development.

The 100 foot easement across the Hilliard Drain provides a buffer and physically separates the potential commercial development and the residential uses.

Mr. Black asked why the Committee did this when the property around it is "A" one family.

Mr. Fink explained that a large parcel is zoned commercial. This would act as a buffer and would eliminate the possibility of use for small commercial.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-76-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by R. T. Van Sickle representing William Erbele to rezone a parcel at 2309 South Pennsylvania Avenue from "B" one family district to "C" two family district be denied.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as low density residential (4 to 10 dwelling units per net acre). The proposed

change would create an isolated district unrelated to similar districts—a spot zone—and would constitute a grant of a special privilege to an individual as contrasted to the general welfare.

This area along Pennsylvania Avenue has maintained its stability in single family development. If this change is allowed, it will make it difficult to control future requests of this nature and would eventually change the character of the neighborhood.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-78-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Keith M. Bunce to rezone a parcel at 4604 and 4608 North Grand River Avenue from "A" one family and "J" parking to "H" light industrial be denied as filed and that

Commencing in center N. Grand River Ave. 154 feet W. of N and S. $\frac{1}{4}$ line, Section 6 thence NW $\frac{1}{4}$ along N. Grand River Ave. 48.4 ft. N. to N. Section line, E. 45 feet, S. par'l with N. and S. $\frac{1}{4}$ line to beg; except the southerly 200 feet thereof

be rezoned from "A" one family to "H" light industrial.

It has been the policy of the Planning Board to maintain the 150 feet setback along North Grand River Avenue for the following reasons:

The setback would provide adequate area for a future access road to serve the industrial uses and limit the number of access points on North Grand River Avenue.

This would help to insure that the traffic carrying capacity of Grand River is maintained and also provides adequate protection for the residential uses that exist along the south side of North Grand River Avenue.

The recommended setback preserves the aesthetic value of the property and prevents any strip type development adjacent to the right-of-way line of Grand River Ave.

Motion was carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds, and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-79-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that

on the petition initiated by the Planning Board to rezone a parcel of property in the 1500 block of East Grand River Avenue described as:

Commencing N.W. corner of Lot 13, Assessor's Plat No. 2; thence S. 96.88 ft. more or less; thence S. 46° 48' 30" W. 175.6 ft. to the NW'ly line of E. Grand River Ave.; thence N. 41° 16' W. 73.9 ft. the N. 41° 48' E. 166.2 ft. to the E'ly corner of Lot 5, Assessor's Plat No. 54, the NE'ly 75 ft. more or less to beg. being a part of Lots 6 and 7 Assessor's Plat No. 54, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "D" apartment to "C" two family residence district, and the property be rezoned prior to the sale of the site by public bid.

There have been other requests in this area for apartment zoning which have been denied by the Board for the following reasons:

The increased density would be contrary to the Master Land Use Plan and out of character with the surrounding area.

Increased density in the area set aside and designed for lower density tends to overcrowd public utilities and increase traffic congestion.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-80-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Richard A. and Jorita Stowell, represented by Mr. Leo A. Farhat, to rezone a parcel at 3001 and 3005 South Washington Avenue be denied as filed and that the

East 65 feet of Lots 4 and 5

be rezoned from "A" one family to "J" parking;

The westerly 25 feet lying parallel to Washington Avenue

remain "A" one family; and

The balance of the property

be rezoned from "A" one family to "F" commercial district.

The basic land use conditions have changed in this area making this site less desirable for single family development.

Screening to be provided along the south and east lines of the "J" parking district

except for the residential setback on Dunlap Street. Screening to consist of one of the following:

A five foot high dense privet hedge.

A three foot high chain link fence with dense evergreen plantings of a mature height of four to five feet.

A four foot high decorative masonry wall.

Any other screening suggested by the developer upon the approval of the Planning Board.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-81-66

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Charles Felice and James B. Root, represented by Mr. Leo A. Farhat, to rezone a parcel at 1212 and 1218 West Jolly Road from "A" one family district to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied.

The densities allowed under the existing code would permit a 44 unit apartment building to be built on this site. Due to the proximity of the Logan-Jolly intersection and the commercial activity centered there, a Community Unit Plan with a restricted number of units could be considered.

The Board further suggests that the property owners consider a Community Unit Plan.

Motion was carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

STREET COMMITTEE

S-3-66P

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds that the Preliminary Plat of Cushion Replat was approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Final Plat to be developed with public improvements as required by the Michigan State Plat Act and Lansing Subdivision Regulations.
2. Lots 1 through 4 shall be platted with 56 foot frontage on Massachusetts Avenue. Lots 5 and 6 shall be platted with 55 foot frontages and Lot 7 with 65 foot frontage on Whyte Street.

3. Construction and improvement drawings shall be submitted and approved prior to filing Final Plat.
4. All required easements shall be recorded on the face of the Final Plat.
5. All lots shall be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.
6. This approval shall be valid for a period of one year from the date of Planning Board Action. Expiration date is Wednesday, June 7, 1967.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

S-10-66P and F

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds that a public hearing be held on Tuesday, July 5, 1966 for the preliminary Plat of Replat 58 of Eco Farms Subdivision at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1, Sixth Floor of City Hall.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. Reynolds stated that a report will be ready for the next meeting.

Mr. Reynolds then gave a synopsis of a trip made by Councilman Moore, Mr. Walter Neller and Mr. Lloyd Mole and himself together with a group from Flint visiting Plazas in Connecticut and New York. He has some pictures and some commentary being prepared that will be presented at the next meeting.

FINANCE

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Bretz that the Secretary request a van type of wagon for the department vehicle, as approved in the 1966-67 budget.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

PLANNING DIRECTORS REPORT

Mr. Daoust of the firm of Robert E. Gladstone, Consultants had presented a Community Renewal Program research report, comments on the report were made.

A brochure on the Oakland County Planning Commission Conference to be held June 8th in Rochester, Michigan, was mentioned to the board.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Gaus stated that he had received some comments from former board members relative to the fact that some had and some had not received gavels. There was some discussion on whether or not this was or should be included in the Rules of Procedure.

The Chairman appointed a committee consisting of Mr. Gaus, as Chairman, Mr. Reynolds and Mr. Siebert to set up a policy on the issuing of Gavels and certificates to retiring board members and furnish their report at the meeting on June 21st, so that it can become a part of the Rules of Procedure.

Meeting adjourned at 11:47 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

M

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, June 21, 1966

Meeting called to order at 7:40 P.M. by
Chairman Russell H. Fink.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Black, Fink, Gaus, Manz,
Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Absent: Bretz and Heino—2.

HEARINGS

Z-84-66

Mr. Francis N. Fine appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 3313 W. Mt. Hope Avenue from "A" one family residence to "D-M" multiple dwelling district and advised that the property in question is immediately east of the trailer park on Mt. Hope. There are approximately 7 acres involved, and believes that a good use of it would be in the form of multiple. He presented plans for the proposed buildings. They will be two story apartments with bedrooms on the upper floors and day time living on the first floor. This would be a proper buffer for the trailer park, and with this use on Mt. Hope is probably the best use for the property. They propose something just under 12 units per acre. Parking of about 2 to 1 ratio. He presented a blue print. This is different from the conventional type. They feel it will be difficult to secure other uses next to the trailer court. They can give no estimate of the rental at this time, but want to have a conventional price.

Mr. Black asked about the extension of Cooley St. Mr. Fine answered that to the best of his knowledge this is not in any-ones plans, but they did get the impression that it might be something that the Board would want some day. This is a flexible plan.

Mr. Black then stated there should be some way out of the area to the South.

Mr. Fink stated that the staff would object to an ingress and egress into a residential area, however there should be some emergency exits.

The Director advised that considerable time has been spent on this area. The Board

should review the street arrangements. If these parcels develop, the Board should work with the developers on a contiguous street pattern.

Mr. Manz asked, if under the present rules wasn't it necessary to have an intersection, because of the length of the street? The director advised that the maximum length was 600 feet.

Mr. Manz then asked if the owners had been approached in regard to obtaining the 100 ft. to the east, and Mr. Fine stated they had been contacted.

Mr. Reynolds asked what effect the trailer court would have on this and vice versa. Mr. Fine replied that there would be some sort of wall arrangement between them. There will be a patio type area between the trailers and the apartments. This has not been completely thought out yet. Staggering may make a better looking area. He told of how they overcome a like situation in East Lansing and after the first building is constructed will go from there as to its acceptance.

Mr. Fink asked how many units proposed in each structure and Mr. Fine advised there would be eight, primarily of one and two bedrooms. They will try to be flexible.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-103-66

The chairman gave an explanation of why the second hearing was granted on this petition.

Mr. Clark Ackley, Architect appeared in behalf of the petition and advised that he is representing the owners of the property at 2709 Eifert Road. He reminded the board that at the last meeting they presented plans and outlined the purpose for asking for the adjustment of the zoning. They started to build about the time this part of the city was being annexed. A permit was taken out while in the township. A deed from the owner restricted this property to be utilized for church purposes. Since that time (about two years ago) they have become very cramped and are attempting to do something about it. They have been negotiating for some time

with the Neller Company and had another conference yesterday. Due to the fact that they have been unable to adopt any proper plans for this, and Council has not acted on the motion for rezoning, have been unable to give them an offer so that they could make any move on it. Without additional space their program is not conventional.

They have reached the saturation point and they must expand in order to adequately take on their program. It is imperative that they move ahead to relieve the situation. In the event this doesn't materialize, as far as the proposed center is concerned, want to be able to go ahead. They have a financial investment here of at least \$100,000 and feel that in the next few months could start on the building. There are problems that must be solved.

Mr. Reynolds asked about the deed restriction and Mr. Ackley stated that the restriction stated that it must be used for church purposes. Mr. Reynolds then asked what would happen if it were not used as such and Mr. Ackley replied that he thought it would revert to the original owners, the Kahres. The Kahres could rescind this restriction.

Mr. Siebert asked the size of the present structure and was advised that it is 32 by 80, two stories high.

Mr. Black stated that he wondered how the situation of a church in this location developed in the first place. How long has Eifert Road been in existence. Does the turn in the road South originally go through where I-96 is now, and is this an isolated piece of property?

Mr. Ackley advised that the road did originally go through directly south, and was rather heavily traveled running parallel to Cedar. It had some residences on it. When the property was acquired it was a compromise.

They had a preference of another piece of property but Kahres offered it to the church. Lots having a frontage on Cedar were kept for commercial development on Cedar. This was before the thoroughway was determined. This was developed later and leaves the church in its present place.

Mr. Sam Harris of the Delta Township Planning Commission appeared and mentioned the offices he has held in the church. He stated that this site was picked after a great deal of consideration and was picked because it was handy to a large portion of the city plus Holt and Mason. At the present time they are simply asking for a continuation of its present use. The property is deed restricted for religious purposes only. The congregation has grown tremendously. They are now at a point where they must have larger quarters. They believe this site is one which has been approved by Bishop Emerick and Dr. Fletcher Plant who selects sites throughout the state. This church draws many people that are transients. They feel it is important to stay where they are.

John E. Blewett, Vicar of St. Michaels appeared and stated that he would like to recommend to the committee their immediate need in terms of its children. They now have 6 inches per child in the church and urged continuation of the only existing use of this property. It is an easy site for members to get to.

Mr. Black asked for a clarification on the 6 inches per child in the present area used for church school and wondered if this shouldn't be 6 sq. inches. The Rev. Mr. Blewett explained that also in the basement is the kitchen plus the church school. If the growth continues in the future they will have to have multiple services.

Mr. Siebert asked the number of children and was advised that they have 135 registered. There are 84 families numbering 350 souls.

Mr. Fink read a letter he had received from Johnson, Johnson and Roy, Planning Consultants.

Mr. Richard Neller read a prepared statement to the Board and then copies were handed to the Board. (on file in Planning Department).

Mr. Black asked where the four recently acquired parcels were and if the Kahres Farm were included in this. Mr. Neller replied they have acquired 20 acres between Eifert Road and the Kahres Farm.

Mr. Black then asked if it were correct that the Neller Co. does not own the church, gas station and the farm and was informed that was right.

Further discussion followed.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Recess from 8:42 to 9:07 P.M.

BUSINESS SESSION

Mr. Reynolds had left the meeting.

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz that the minutes of May 3rd be approved.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Fink gave an explanation of the Zoning process.

Mr. Reynolds came in at 9:32 P.M.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-61-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus that the Board recommend to City Council that

the petition by Robert Refior to rezone a parcel in the 700-800 Armstrong Road N. described as:

Lots 1-12, and Reservation "B", Penn.-Cedar Subdivision, part of N.W. 1/4 1 1/4, Section 3, T3N, R2W, Delhi Township, Ingham County, Michigan and, commencing at the E. 1/2 post of N.E. frac. 1/4 of Section 4, T3N, R2W, said E. 1/2 post being the N.W. corner of Penn.-Cedar Subdivision, thence East, 783.92 feet on the north line of Penn.-Cedar Subdivision to the N.E. corner of said Subdivision; thence N. 41 ft., W. 183 feet; thence West, 785.89 feet; thence 50° 04' E. 183.00 feet to the point of beginning.

from "A" one family district to "D" Apartment district amended to Special Use Permit in accordance with Section 36-42 (2) of the Lansing Zoning Code, be granted subject to the following conditions being compiled with:

That the building development and off-street parking and drives be located essentially as shown on the plan submitted.

The height of the proposed building shall not exceed 2 1/2 stories.

Residential occupancy for the proposed use shall not exceed 200 persons.

Off-street parking shall be increased to one space for each two beds. The location of the additional off-street parking shall be subject to approval by the Planning Board.

Any relocation of the proposed building from that shown on the plan submitted shall be subject to the approval of the Planning Department.

Where the parking areas or private drives abut adjacent residential use they shall be screened with one of the following:

1. A 5 ft. high dense privet hedge.
2. A 3 ft. high chain link fence with dense evergreen plantings of a mature height of 5 ft. to 5 ft. 6 in., or
3. Any other type of screening that may be suggested by the developer with the approval of the Planning Department.

The entire site shall be replatted showing the necessary dedicated street access for the property to the north, and all necessary utility easement. This is in accord with the subdivision regulations.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-62-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus that the Board recommend to City Council that

the request for withdrawal of the petition by Robert Refior to rezone a parcel in the 700-800 Armstrong Rd. N. described as:

Lot 13 through 24 inclusive of Penn.-Cedar Subdivision

from "A" one family to "D" Apartment district be accepted and that the property remain in its present classification.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

STREETS COMMITTEE

SS-16-64

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz that the Board approve the concept in general of the Pleasant Grove Extension South, and instruct the staff to proceed toward a firm plan working jointly with the departments of Public Service and Traffic.

Discussion followed.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Fink, Gaus, Manz and Siebert—5.

Nays: None.

S-11-66p

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz that a public hearing be held on the Preliminary Plat of the Keegan Property on Tuesday, July 19, 1966 at 7:30 P.M.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

S-11-66p

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz that a public hearing be set on the Preliminary Plat of Decker Subdivision on Tuesday, July 19, 1966 at 7:30 P.M.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

S-12-66p

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz that a public hearing be set on the Preliminary Plat of Simkin Village on Tuesday, July 19, 1966 at 7:30 P.M.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

BUILDINGS AND PROPERTIES

BP-12-66

Motion by Manz, seconded by Black that the Board recommend to City Council that

after considering the request of Mr. and Mrs. Bernard Byron to purchase city owned property located on E. Main St. between Shepard St. and S. Clemens Avenue, that:

"Lots 1, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, and 24 of Shields Subd."

be retained by the city.

The Board believes that because all of these lots front on E. Main St. they should be retained by the city until such time as necessary pavement and right-of-way widths can be determined for this section of E. Main St. and the proposed connection with Aurelius Rd. extension.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

SS-3-66

Mr. Alan E. Tubbs, Planner gave an explanation of the area covered which is between Mt. Hope-Pine Tree Connector, Kalamazoo and Potter Park and distributed a report. Mr. Tubbs then gave an explanation of the area how flooding could affect the city, and the affects fill would have, what alternatives the city might take and a recommendation of the Staff. Mr. Tubbs mentioned requests that he had received for copies of the report and asked if the Board wished them distributed at this time.

Motion by Black, seconded by Manz that the report be reviewed and the Board will consider at the meeting on July 19th. The report is not to be released until after that time.

Mr. Siebert asked the number of organizations asking for the report and Mr. Tubbs advised there were six to eight requests already.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. Reynolds presented slides that were taken on a recent trip East of malls and parking structures.

ORDINANCE

Mr. Black stated that the typing should be finished so that the Zoning Ordinance could be reviewed at the next meeting or a special meeting.

Mr. Edwin P. Brown, Assistant Director, called attention to the fact that all property in the city would be zoned. This would include roads, right-of-ways, alleys, and recreation areas. The zoning map as completed to date was shown to the Board.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. Tubbs advised the board that the Chamber of Commerce have gone on record supporting the Capital Improvements Program. They have published a summary and will have about 1500 copies for distribution.

PLANNING DIRECTORS REPORT

The Director advised that Mrs. Bertha F. Silverman had been hired as the new typist.

The Director reported that after the class from Michigan State University observed the recent board meeting they recommended that:

Copies of the agenda should be distributed to the audience.

Overall orientation of the meeting could be improved.

Board members and staff are not referring their remarks to the chairman.

Structures and clarification on zoning classification meanings is needed.

Graphics could be improved.

OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

Z-111-66

A letter had been received from Mr. Flynn M. Wells, Chief, Relocation Asst. Officer, Dept. of State Highway in regard to this zoning petition for property located at 925 W. Hillsdale, and inasmuch as the Zoning Committee have not made a recommendation to the Board on this petition the letter was referred to them for consideration.

NEW BUSINESS

Z-124-64

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus that the Board recommend to City Council that the request for withdrawal of the petition by Robert R. Dykman, treasurer Christian Reformed Church, to rezone a parcel at 3526 Forrest Road from "A" one-family to "B" residence district be accepted and that the property remain in its present classification.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-113-63

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus that the Board recommend to City Council that the request for withdrawal of the petition by Harold M. Davis for Lester C. Foote to

rezone a parcel at 1116 S. Washington Avenue from "F-1" commercial to "G-2" wholesale district be accepted and that the property remain in its present classification.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

On the matter of presentation of gavels and certificates to former board members, Mr. Gaus reported that he had no report for this meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 11:01 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE THE BOARD OF CANVASSERS OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, August 2, 1966

10:00 o'clock A.M.

August 3, 1966

The City Board of Canvassers of the City of Lansing met in the Mayor's Conference Room, 9th floor, City Hall on Wednesday, August 3, 1966 to canvass the returns of the Primary Election held on Tuesday, August 2, 1966.

Present: Beulah M. Rouse, Esther M. Niver, Robert M. Busfield, Jr. and Theo Fulton, City Clerk—4.

Absent: A. Geraldine Rapaport—1.

The Board canvassed the votes with the following results.

PROPOSITION (CHARTER AMENDMENT)

(Policemen's and Firemen's Pension Revision)

The whole number of votes cast for the Charter Amendment: "Shall Chapter 16 of the Lansing City Charter (including Chapter 29 of the previous City Charter), being the Policemen's and Firemen's Retirement System, be generally revised to change the basis of computing final average compensation from the retirant's last 5 years' pay to his 24 highest consecutive months' pay; prohibit service beyond age 60; lower the optional retirement age with 25 years' service from 55 to 50; provide for

retirant's widow to receive $\frac{1}{2}$ his retirement allowance and eliminate options permitting other beneficiaries; and to revise and modernize the language thereof and make technical adjustments thereto? was 11,488 of which:

8,673 votes were cast in favor of the Charter Amendment.

2,815 votes were cast against the Charter Amendment.

Whereas, the Charter Amendment having received sufficient votes was passed.

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 o'clock A.M.

In Witness Whereof, We have hereunto set our hands and affixed the Seal of the City of Lansing this 3rd day of August, in the year One Thousand Nine Hundred and Sixty-Six.

BEULAH M. ROUSE,
Chairman,

ESTHER M. NIVER,
ROGER M. BUSFIELD, JR.,
Board of Canvassers.

(SEAL)

Attest:

THEO FULTON,
Clerk of Board of Canvassers.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, July 5, 1966

Meeting called to order at 7:43 P.M. by Chairman Russell Fink.

An outline of the meeting was read by the Secretary.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz and Siebert—6.

Absent: Reynolds—1.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

The chair was turned over to the Secretary for the annual election of officers.

The floor was opened to nomination for Chairman.

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino that Mrs. Ramona J. Bretz be nominated for the office of Chairman.

Motion by Black, seconded by Siebert that the nominations be closed and that an unanimous ballot be cast for Mrs. Bretz.

Motion carried unanimously.

The floor was then opened to nomination for Vice Chairman.

Motion by Manz, seconded by Gaus that Mr. Kenneth C. Black be nominated for the office of Vice Chairman and that the nominations be closed and a unanimous ballot be cast for Mr. Black.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mrs. Bretz assumed the chair.

The Chairman on behalf of the Board, commended Mr. Russell Fink for service to the Board as Chairman for the past two years.

Motion by Black, seconded by Heino that the Secretary write an official letter of appreciation to Mr. Fink.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

HEARINGS

S-9-66

Coachlight Estates. A preliminary hearing on a proposed plat by Rosehill Builders for property at the northeast corner of Waverly Road and Miller Road.

Mr. James A. Church gave an explanation of the location of the area in relation to the city and Master Plan.

Mr. Leonard R. Farber, the developer, stated that there are 408 residential lots. Their proposal to the staff had a small park and elementary school site. After a meeting with the Board of Education and the staff they have enlarged the area to what they believe will meet with all recommendations. They have not reached a conclusion on the commercial versus the multiple. They believe in the future there will be a need for the commercial and want it zoned as such now.

Mr. Black asked about the exception areas and the developer advised this is not owned by them. Mr. Black then asked what they were used for and Mr. Farber reported there were homes here.

Mr. Fink asked what is the difference in the commercial proposed and the recommendation of the staff. Mr. Farber replied that they have asked for 10 acres and the staff have proposed five acres. Mr. Fink then asked for the rationale of the staff.

Mr. James A. Church, Planner stated that due to the amount of commercial on Waverly, the staff did not believe this much was needed and he mentioned the commercial areas near this site. At the present time there are no petitions filed for rezoning of any part of this plat.

Discussion followed.

The hearing was open for public discussion.

Mr. Edward Newton, of 6048 S. Waverly, stated that he opposed as he didn't feel that they should come in with commercial

and multiple. There is a lot of commercial around there and he didn't feel they need it. He mentioned commercial in the area which will hurt the residential across the street. These residential lots are restricted to 100 ft.

Mr. M. R. Drake, of 6042 S. Waverly, stated he was opposed because of the health. He doesn't want the same as Churchill Downs. A 60 ft. frontage is asked for. He is restricted to 100 ft.

Mr. Gordon D. Phillips, of 917 Osband, stated that he owns property across the street from the proposed site. The restrictions they have are strict compared to this subdivision. He does not feel it should be accepted.

Mr. Keith G. Smith, of 6022 S. Waverly, stated that he felt it should be given some consideration for middle class type of homes because not all are able to afford \$20,000 homes.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

S-10-66

Mary Ann Meadows preliminary subdivision proposed by Mr. George H. Orten on property at the northeast corner of Reo Road and Ingham St.

Mr. Thomas W. Newton gave an explanation of the present use of the surrounding area and the plans of the petitioner to split this property into 60 ft. lots.

Mr. Siebert asked where the 5th lot was. Mr. Newton explained the previous splits.

The Director advised that this is both preliminary and final plat.

The hearing was open for public discussion.

Mr. Charles McPeak, of 522 S. Butler, asked if all of these lots were proposed to be 200 ft. wide. Mr. McPeak was advised that the surrounding lots were originally 200 ft. frontage and 300 ft. deep. The need is now for smaller lots.

Mr. McPeak then asked if 100 ft. lots are to be cut down. Mr. Newton then advised that there are no 100 ft. lots.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

Z-96-66

Mr. Mitchel Skory, appeared for a rehearing in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 905 Cleveland Street, from "B" one family to commercial amended to include 901 Cleveland St. Mr. Skory stated that he wants to continue 901 Cleveland as a TV repair shop, eliminate the house

at 905, and add on to the building but leave the front part of the lot for parking. This will eliminate parking from the street relieving the congestion. Cleveland is narrow and passing becomes an issue when cars are parked on one side.

Mr. Gaus asked if the petitioner were asking for the rezoning of 905 or 901 and Mr. Skory stated that he asked for the rehearing so that both parcels could be rezoned.

Mr. Siebert asked the width of 905, and was advised it was about 28 ft. The corner lot is about 33 ft. At the time when both houses were built there was a joint driveway that is now causing conflict. This rezoning would solve a lot of problems.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-110-66

Mr. William K. Bird appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 324 S. Butler Blvd. from "C" two family to "F" commercial district, and stated that he has a beauty salon at 1218 S. Logan now. He anticipates General Motors taking his property on Olds Avenue and would like to relocate on Butler.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-111-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 925 W. Hillsdale Street from "C" two family to "E" apartment shop district.

Mr. Warren B. Nelson of 923 W. Butler stated that he was opposed to the rezoning if it were to be a barber shop and apartment.

Mrs. Bretz advised Mr. Nelson that the board was considering rezoning of the entire block and asked for his feelings.

Mr. Nelson stated that he didn't want to live next to a barber shop.

Mr. Carl Taylor of 911 W. Hillsdale asked if the petition goes through what would the petitioner request. Would a pool room be allowed.

The Director advised that any type of commercial could be developed on the first floor.

Mr. Taylor then remarked that he was not in favor of the rezoning.

Mr. Ollie Whitelow, 1016 W. Hillsdale, stated that he lives next to the church. If rezoned for commercial, he will not be able to get out. Can't get out now. The park is full day and night. He is opposed to the rezoning.

Mr. Wilbert Watts, 1017 W. Hillsdale reported that he is not in favor because he doesn't know what they are going to put in. It is really congested there. They have enough trouble now.

Mr. Charles McPeak of 522 S. Butler asked about the north side of the street and if it were being considered for rezoning and was advised that it was not.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-113-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 7011 S. Cedar Street from "A" one family residence to "H" light industrial district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-114-66

Mr. Richard Herrmann, representing Loomis Realty Co., appeared in behalf of the petition by Harold Farmer to rezone the property at 117 E. Elm St. from "D" multiple to "J" parking district. Mr. Herrmann stated that the Greek Church wishes to buy this for parking.

Mr. Herrmann told of the uses in the area and other parking facilities and mentioned they would like to get additional parking in the area.

Mr. Fink asked if they had received a recommendation on the previous zoning request. The Director advised that Council had approved, and they had been advised of the church's desires to obtain this property.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-115-66

Mrs. Evelyn White appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at the S.W. corner of Grand River and Maryland St. described as:

Lots 42 and 43 Berton Heights Sub-division, City of Lansing

from "C" two family residence to "D-M" multiple dwelling district and reported that this property has been vacant since about 1921. Mrs. White feels this would be the best use. They want to replace the property they are now using. They have an offer to purchase.

Mr. Siebert asked how many units are anticipated, and Mrs. White stated they would like four. She submitted a render-

ing. They may include a basement. They feel it might enhance the neighborhood.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-116-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property on Remy Drive, Apollo Drive, Ranger Road and Mint Road described as:

Lots 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21 of Lantex Industrial Park

from "G-2" wholesale to light industrial.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-117-66

Mr. Andrew J. Husband, Jr. appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 716 and 800 W. St. Joseph St. from "C" two family to "F" commercial district, and stated that he is representing his brothers in their delivery service. They are in the process of relocating because of the highway. They bought this property with the thought in mind that the north side of St. Joseph St. could be commercialized. On talking with the Planning staff, were informed that it would be too congested. All their savings are tied up in this property. They want to expand as soon as they can start their business back up again. They have been approached by the State Highway to break the hill down to level with the other properties in the neighborhood. He then asked if this would have any effect on traffic. They are unable to use the property now. They have presented plans.

Mr. Gaus asked what the Master Plan proposed for this section of St. Joseph and the Director advised that this area is proposed for multiple family. The Director then advised of the Master Plan recommended usage of the area east of Logan.

Further discussion was held about his plans.

Mr. Louis Husband stated that he realized that most of the businesses in the area rent the buildings owned by other people. There has been one rezoning in the area for a small business. He then asked if the Master Plan takes into consideration that these renting businesses will need a new location. He further questioned what thoughts had been given to where these people would locate.

Mrs. Bretz informed Mr. Husband that the Zoning Committee and the City Council looked over this area and mentioned some of the reasons for moving business out of this section was because of the ramps.

Mr. Husband then told of the problems involved in obtaining suitable property.

The Director then reported on the Senate bill concerning on relocations.

Mr. Black asked if the staff could get any information on grading for the Board's review, also on the ramps.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-119-66

Mr. B. Gale Hetwick, Executive Secretary of the General Assembly of the Church of God in Michigan, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at Cavanaugh at Alpha Streets described as:

Lot 89 Pennway Subdivision No. 4
City of Lansing, Ingham County

from "D-M" multiple dwelling district to "D-1" professional offices district. Mr. Hetwick stated they propose to build 2,250 sq. ft. to accommodate four full time and two part time persons. Architectural plans will be available next month.

Mr. Gaus asked if there were any connection with this and the church across the street and Mr. Hetwick advised that he is representative for the state organization representing 132 churches.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-120-66

Mr. Byron T. Bradley appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 2721 N. Grand River Avenue from "D-M" multiple dwelling and "A" one family to "F" commercial district and reported that the property is presently being used as a day care center.

They are actually limited to 20 due to a technicality. They plan a 20 by 24 steel and concrete addition to the present structure. They feel that this will be an addition to the neighborhood. One building on the east line is to be removed. The other building will be moved over to conform with the existing code.

Mr. Black asked if he wanted the entire parcel rezoned, and Mr. Bradley stated he did.

Mr. Bradley then added that the rear of this property is zoned "A" one due to the elevation. The area is flooded at times. The parcel to the west is used for apartments, with the low area used for playground. He has already contacted someone to raise the elevation and will use this for playground area. This will conform with the property next door, if used as proposed.

This will be back filled to raise it above flood level so that it can be used at all times.

Mr. Black asked about access to the back, and was advised that it could only be reached from Grand River.

Mr. Fink asked if he needed the back part rezoned for an anticipated purpose. The Director advised that the staff have not analyzed this so far.

Mr. Bradley then added that the back portion rezoning is not needed, however he needs some of the area for acreage necessitated for the number of children to be cared for.

Some discussion was held on the filling of the flood plain and Mr. Bradley said the back filling would only bring it up to the grade of the property next door so there would be no stagnant pools.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-121-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 207 W. Grand River Avenue from Residential "C" two family to Commercial "F" district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-122-66

Mr. W. F. Nuechterlein, Architect, appeared for Our Savior Lutheran Church and School in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 1601 W. Holmes Road from "A" residential to "B" residential and reported that he was here to answer questions that the Board might have. They are requesting because the property was purchased about 10 years ago and a school was built. On annexation it was placed in "A" one family and in order to erect the church they must have it rezoned to the "B" one family classification.

Mr. Black asked if there would be any change in the area and was advised they have about 18 acres but anticipate no change.

The Director advised that the previous owner intended to plat. Does the church intend to extend the street that is now a public easement? Mr. Nuechterlein advised they would not like to make it a public street because of control.

Further discussion followed.

Plans presented were shown to the board.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Mr. Reynolds came in at 9:15 P.M.

Z-123-66

Mr. Charles T. Blair appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 3839 Moores River Drive from single family "A" one to "D-M" multiple dwelling district. He advised that there is 24,000 sq. ft. and they would like to build a 12 unit apartment house. He remarked that most of the property to the north and east has been up for rezoning. He doesn't believe this rezoning would work a hardship on the "A" one family. Most of these are to the east. There is a duplex on the corner of Waverly and Cooley. There is a small home on this property with a value of from \$4,000 to \$5,000. He feels it would be an improvement to the neighborhood.

Mr. Reynolds asked if on the property to the north, were there any houses and was informed that there is one house quite a bit off the road, about 200 to 250 ft., and then a small home on higher level of land from the Elks Building.

Mr. Siebert asked if they had any plans, and where would the entrance be off Waverly. Mr. Blair stated there would be 24 units allowed, and they would start with 12 and build back on the property.

Mr. Reynolds asked for the plans to show where the traffic routes would be and curb cuts.

Mr. Blair advised that the traffic would have to come in off Cooley. He will present plans.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-124-66

Mr. Cecil W. Ferris appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 5700 block of Orchard Court described as:

Commencing at a point 1141.4 N. and 222.75 E. of the S.W. corner of Section 3, T3N, R2W, Delhi Township, Ingham County, Michigan thence N. 822.1 ft. thence E. 222.75 ft. thence S. 822.1 ft. thence W. 222.75 ft. to place of beginning

from "A" one residential to "D-M" multiple dwelling district and stated that they have a frontage of 832 ft. Their plans call for 6 buildings containing 12 units each or 72 apartments. These will be designed into lots. Each lot will be 25,890 sq. ft. which would allow more than required land area for each apartment. They will place a fence across rear of the property. There is an unimproved street and no public utilities in at the present time. The street is still unpaved. Sewer and water are pro-

posed for the near future. A brochure was presented to each board member giving the plat plan.

He told of development in the area. They feel this is a reasonable request. There will be parking in the rear of the building with an access drive to each building parallel to the street. Ingress on one side and egress on the other. There will be 23 parking spaces for each building.

Mr. Gaus asked if Orchard Court goes all the way through to Louise and does Louise go to Pennsylvania and was advised that it does and is being finished now. They have access to Pennsylvania on Louise and to Miller Road. Traffic would not have to use residential streets at all. 80% of the land in the area would be to multiple family. Now there are only 4 houses facing Orchard in the three block area. It isn't suitable for marginal single family use.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-125-66

Mr. Donald Hines, Attorney, representing General Motors Corporation appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 800 Block of South Walnut Street described as:

All of Lots 4 and 5 and the West ¼ of Lot 3, Block 178, Original Plat, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan; and that parcel of land described as: The West 123.75 ft. of Lots 13 and 14 and the North 8 feet of the West 123.75 feet of Lot 12, in Sparrow's Subdivision of Block 178, Original Plat, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

the southeast corner of West Main St. and South Sycamore Street and 812 South Pine Street described as:

The South 45½ feet of Lot 1 and the South 45½ feet of the East ¼ of Lot 2, and the West ¼ of Lot 4, and all of Lot 5, Block 181, Original Plat, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

the 800 block of West Main Street described as:

All of Block 1, of Morrison's Subdivision of Block 16 in Townsend's Plat of the North ½ of Section 20, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, Excepting therefrom, First Lots 4, 15, and 16, Block 1, said Morrison's Subdivision, and Second, the South ½ of Lot 17 and the South ½ of Lot 18 Block 1, said Morrison's Subdivision, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

the 900 Block of S. Butler Boulevard described as:

All of Lot 106 and the East 125 feet of Lot 107, and all of Lot 107, and all

of Lots 108 to 117, inclusive, and all of Lot 121, all in Assessor's Plat No. 3 on Blocks 1, 2 and 15 of Townsend's Subdivision on Section 20, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "C" two family to "I" heavy industrial district, and

All of Lots 1, and 2 and the East $\frac{3}{4}$ of Lot 3, Block 178, Original Plat, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan;

and that parcel of land described as:

Commencing at the Northeast corner of Sparrow's Subdivision on Block 178, Original Plat, City of Lansing, and thence West 206 $\frac{1}{4}$ feet, thence South 78 feet, thence East 206 $\frac{1}{4}$ feet, thence North 78 feet to place of beginning, in the City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "D-1" professional offices to "I" heavy industrial district and the Southwest corner of West Main Street and South Pine Street described as:

The North 103.0 feet of Lot 1 and the North 103.0 feet of the East $\frac{1}{4}$ of Lot 2, Block 181, Original Plat, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

the 800 Block of William Street described as:

All of Lots 4, 14, and 16, Block 1 of Morrison's Subdivision of Block 16 in Townsend's Plat of the North $\frac{1}{2}$ of Section 20, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

be rezoned from "J" parking district to "I" heavy industrial district and the northeast corner of South Logan Street and Olds Avenue described as:

Lots 122 and 128, inclusive, in Assessor's Plat No. 3 on Blocks 1, 2 and 15 of Townsend's Subdivision on Section 20, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "F" commercial to "I" heavy industrial district. Mr. Hines presented a layout of the area for rezoning to the board members.

He mentioned that the petition is complicated because the parcels are in four separate blocks and have four different zoning classifications. Mr. Hines then explained the drawings presented to the Board. All the property is owned by General Motors except two pieces that have options on and upon which the sale should be consummated very shortly. They feel that this is a logical request as this area is in the Master Plan as an industrial area. I-496 is on the north.

The Director queried as to whether or not General Motors intended to put in a drop forge or any other similar type of

use and was informed that neither he nor anyone at the General Motors Plant here would be able to answer this.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-126-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 1216 and 1222 W. Washtenaw St. from "B" residential to "F" commercial district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Recess from 9:45 to 10:41 P.M.

BUSINESS SESSION

Z-63-66

Motion by Heino, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by John Sarkozl to rezone a parcel at 3425 North East Street described as:

Lots 82 and 83 Supervisor's Plat of Schworer's Bloomfield Farms, City of Lansing

from "A" one family residential district to "G-2" wholesale district be denied.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as residential.

The rezoning of this site would be a direct encroachment into the established residential area on North East Street.

The change would adversely affect living conditions in the immediate area primarily through the increase of traffic and activity, and would affect property values in the vicinity and might deter the improvement of adjacent properties.

Mr. Reynolds stated that he feels like the request is reasonable with the proper buffering and he doesn't see any real objections.

Mr. Heino stated there are some nice homes across the street on the west side of Larch.

Mr. Manz asked if Lots 60 and 61 are "G-2" and was informed that they are.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-82-66

Motion by Heino, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by John A. Tysman, President, Estate Property Purchasers Investors Co. Inc. to rezone a parcel at 3000 block of Aurelius Road, described as:

West 136.6 feet of Lot 3, of Supervisors Plat of Robinson Road Subd., and the west 136.6 feet of Lot 4 of Supervisors Plat of Robinson Road Subd.

from "A" one family residential to "C" two family district be denied.

The change would be contrary to the established land use pattern which is predominantly single family residence.

This request would be a spot zone. There are other lots in the immediate area, similar in nature, that would be difficult to control if this request were granted.

The width of Aurelius Road is 66 feet. The desirable width for future widening would be 100 feet. This would reduce the size of these lots by 17 feet.

Increased density stripping along major streets without proper setbacks and access roads, defeats the purpose of the major streets.

The size of Lot 4 (66 feet by 136.6 feet) is below the recommended standards which allows proper development with the necessary setbacks.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-83-66

Motion by Heino, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Sun Oil Company to rezone a parcel at Southeast corner of E. Kalamazoo and Clifford described as:

Lots 23 and 24, Clears Subd., except commencing at the N.E. corner of said Lot 24, Clears Subd. east 50 feet, southwesterly 2.10 feet south of the N.W. corner of said Lot 24

from "B" one family to "E" apartment shop district be denied.

The Planning Board considered a request for this property on October 6, 1965 (Z-152-65) for a change from "B" one family to "E-2" drive-in. This request was recommended for denial for essentially the same reasons listed under this case.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as residential (medium density 4-10 dwellings units per net acre).

The "E" apartment zoning would allow several uses that would be detrimental to the residential area.

The enactment of the proposed "Non-Forming Use Policy" could be used for orderly elimination of this type of use.

Because of the street alignment, grade, and land use on the north side of Kalamazoo, traffic flow through this area is a big factor to be considered.

The Board does not believe the size of the parcel is adequate for commercial development without having a direct and adverse affect on the adjacent residential properties and traffic flow on Kalamazoo.

The site could be used for relocation of a residential structure from the I-496 corridor.

The City Council has not taken any action on this matter as of this date.

Mr. Reynolds mentioned there is a station on the corner now. There is a demand for duplexes. If zoned "C-2" could be moved readily.

Mr. Fink reported that he supported the staff recommendation, but would concur with Mr. Reynolds. The Board has the responsibility to rezone to the next best use.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Reynolds that the motion be amended to be recommended for "C" two family district.

Motion on the amendment failed by the following vote:

Yeas: Fink, Heino and Reynolds—3.

Nays: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Manz and Siebert—5.

Original motion then passed by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: Gaus and Manz—2.

Z-84-66

Motion by Heino, seconded by Gaus that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Francis N. Fine to rezone a parcel at 3313 W. Mt. Hope Avenue described as:

Commencing 820 ft. W. of N. $\frac{1}{4}$ post Section 30, thence S. 1300 ft. E. 100 ft. S. 515 ft. W. 240 ft., N. 1815 ft., E. 140 ft. to beg.; Section 30, T4N, R2W

from "A" one family residence to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied.

PRO:

The types of dwelling proposed to be developed are new to the Lansing area and should be encouraged. The quality, the quantity and the range of dwelling types available will in a large measure determine the vitality and livability of Lansing.

Consolidation of the several long narrow parcels of land in this area would permit a pattern of development that could complement the existing development and provide a range of housing types.

CON:

The legislation which sets forth the scope of planning refers to the following objectives:

Proper arrangement of streets in relation to other existing or planned streets and to the Master Plan.

Adequate and convenient open spaces for traffic, utilities, access of fire-fighting apparatus, recreation, light and air.

Adequate and convenient open space for the avoidance of congestion of population.

Lessen congestion of the public streets.

Applying these objectives to the proposed zoning we find that there is only a remote relationship to the streets which were projected and anticipated in the area; Skye Road, Lewton and Cooley.

The right-of-way space provided for traffic does not propose to meet the minimum street width for single family development (60 feet) nor the preferred 66 foot standard that would more easily handle the traffic produced in multiple family developments.

The street as proposed could create many double frontage lots as the adjacent land develops. At best it would introduce traffic, noise, danger and fumes unnecessarily to abutting property.

In order to provide sufficient parking; space ordinarily designated as yards has been blacktopped for vehicle use.

The gross area available for each dwelling unit is equivalent to the net area proposed for mobile homes and only about a third of the net area allotted to each family in the now developed single family nearby in spite of reduced area per dwelling there is no provision for group recreation either active or passive.

The remoteness of the site from commercial and recreational facilities would tend to create undue congestion on Mt. Hope Avenue. Congestion due to crowding on the land would have an adverse "spill over" effect on connecting residential streets.

Use of the land as projected would set a precedent for further similar requests. If this type development were expanded adjacent to this proposal the overcrowding and congestion could be extremely acute. The existing street pattern and present development does not lend itself to multiple type zoning.

This change would deter the development of the adjacent land in an orderly manner.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-85-66

Motion by Heino, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Adolph R. Frantz to rezone a parcel at 5249 N. Grand River Avenue from "A" one family residence to "F" commercial district be denied.

The periphery is predominately zoned one family.

Commercial zoning covers a broad range of uses including mobile home parks. If this request were granted, there would be no guarantee to the community of the extent, location or direction of development.

Platting should precede, or be concurrent, with zoning changes, where the zoning indicates an intensive use of the property. This method of approach gives the city some measure of assurance that adequate streets will be constructed, proper circulation and continuity will be provided.

The proposed use, mobile parks, should become a part of the community via channels that will insure a high standard of development, and integration into the surroundings with a minimum of friction.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert.

Nays: None.

Z-86-66

Motion by Heino, seconded by Siebert that Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Charles and Una Joseph to rezone a parcel at 701 West Mt. Hope Avenue from commercial and "J" parking to "D" apartment district be denied, and that the property be zoned "D-M" multiple except:

The west 10 feet and the west 60 feet of the south 60 feet

be zoned "J" parking.

Screening to be provided along the south and west lines of the "J" parking district except for a 25 foot setback on Mt. Hope Ave.

Screening to consist of one of the following:

A 5 ft. high dense privet hedge.

A 3 ft. high chain link fence with dense evergreen plantings of a mature height of five feet to five feet six inches in height.

A 4 ft. high decorative masonry wall.

Or any other type of screening suggested by the developers with the approval of the Planning Department.

The change of zoning will:

Promote redevelopment of the site, removing the existing buildings which violates the front yard requirements.

Allow a new building to be erected which will set back properly from both streets.

Provide for better visibility for automobile traffic.

Change the use from commercial nature back to a residential nature which now exists in the vicinity.

This is a situation where the proposed amendment now before City Council pertaining to the "D-M" multiple dwelling district would be a more desirable zoning for the site, it would:

Discourage over development of the site and keep density and structural changes more compatible with the established residential area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-87-66

Motion by Heino, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Harry A. Taylor to rezone a parcel at 1107 and 1109 Seymour Ave. from "C" two family to "D-M" multiple district be denied.

This rezoning would allow (8) units to be constructed on this site which is double the maximum as indicated on the Master Land Use Plan.

The lots in this block were platted for single family use and have since been split and as many as four (4) structures have been constructed on one lot. The net result

is over crowding of the land and in many cases lots have been created that do not meet the code requirements.

Much of the apartment zoning has not been utilized in this immediate area.

The basic land use conditions have not changed in this area.

The existing sewer facilities in this vicinity are inadequate at this time to sustain an increased density of development.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be used in accord with the existing regulations.

The Planning Board believes that the density allowed under the existing lot area requirements for the "D-M" multiple district would allow over-development on this site. A recommendation to Council for a revised amendment to the multiple districts would allow a reasonable apartment development on this site.

Mr. Manz stated there was "D" next to it, why do we turn this one down?

Mr. Reynolds stated that the area is not objectional to "D-M", but the lot size is too small.

Mrs. Bretz informed the Board that the regulations in the new Zoning Ordinance would not allow a building as proposed.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-88-66

Motion by Heino, seconded by Manz that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Keith Granger to rezone a parcel on the east side of the 3000 block of North East Street (U.S. 27), described as:

Lots 7 through 16 inclusive of the Elmore M. Hunt Subdivision. A portion of the south $\frac{1}{4}$ of the S.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 3. T4N, R2W Lansing Township, Ingham County, Michigan

from "F" commercial and "J" parking to "F" commercial district be denied, and that;

Commencing 20 ft. south and 15 ft. west of the N.E. corner of the property thence south 150 ft., thence west 130 ft., thence north 150 ft., thence east 130 ft. to the beginning

be zoned "F" commercial and the balance of the property except

The west 5 feet along North East St., be zoned "J" parking and

The west 5 feet

be zoned "A" one family, and should remain in open green space with limited access to North East Street.

Ingress and egress to the site shall be from Paulson Street and Howe Avenue.

The traffic Department concurs in this recommendation and will assist the developer in working out the arrangement for ingress and egress to the site.

Mr. Fink asked if this would allow parking along the North side and was informed that it would. They must apply to the Board of Zoning Appeals for parking on the South side.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-89-66

Motion by Heino, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Earl Thielecke to rezone a parcel between 1705 and 1725 Comfort Street described as:

Front 173.25 feet of Lot 31, Assessor's Plat 1, City of Lansing

from "A" one residential to "J" parking district be denied.

The existing development on Comfort Street is low density single-family residential.

The granting of this request would create a spot zone on Comfort St. not in harmony with the existing development to the north, south and east.

The proposed rezoning would allow overdevelopment of the portion of Lot No. 31, which is presently zoned "T" heavy industrial and would be detrimental to the residential nature of Comfort Street.

The change will adversely influence living conditions in immediate area through the increase of traffic and activity.

The land requested to be rezoned can be developed under the existing zoning.

The Master Land Use Plan points out that an industrial highway should be built to service the industrial concentrations adjacent to the beltline railroad located to the west of the site now under consideration. If the proposal were carried out, it would:

Help preserve the residential character of Comfort St.

Provide better accessibility to the existing industrial uses.

Aid materially in correcting traffic problems in the vicinity of the industrial development if the industrial highway were to connect with Logan St. at the crossing of Grand River.

Encourage future development to proceed in an orderly manner.

Mr. Manz asked if there were vacant industrial zoned property in the area and was informed that there is.

Mr. Fink stated that the Master Plan recommend it should be developed for industrial.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-90-66

Motion by Heino, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Laura E. Walker to rezone a parcel at 1319 W. Michigan Avenue from "B" one family residence to "C" two family residence district be denied.

Hardship is not a legally recognized basis for zoning.

Granting of this rezoning would constitute a spot zone or a special favor type of community action. If two family zoning were extended in any direction, overcrowding of the neighborhood would occur and blight would be accelerated.

There are no amenities in the area such as yards, parks, or other open spaces that would be conducive to higher density.

Reasonable use can be and is being made of the property.

Motion carried by the following votes:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-91-66

Motion by Heino, seconded by Fink that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by H. Paul Koepke of Shell Oil Company to rezone a parcel at 612 South Pine St., and 608 W. St. Joseph St. from "C" two family to "T" commercial district be denied.

The Master Land Use Plan does not show a commercial use at this location.

The Central City Plans show this area proposed for high density multiple development, which is compatible with the existing zoning on the site, other than the "E-2" district on the corner.

Rezoning of properties, east of Butler on the north side of West St. Joseph Street, to a commercial use have been denied and discouraged in the recent past by the Planning Board and City Council.

The granting of this request could lead to further requests for commercial zoning in this area, which would be detrimental to existing and proposed residential development.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be redeveloped in accord with the existing zoning.

The change of zoning would enlarge an existing spot zone which is unrelated to the zoning districts in the area.

The community interest would be best served by the use of this site for a high-rise apartment rather than the placement of a gasoline service station.

Mr. Reynolds remarked that he thought this is the only filling station on this side of the street. The staff named the location of the service stations in the area, some less than two blocks away.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-92-66

Motion by Heino, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Natala Litrenta to rezone a parcel at 6065 S. Washington Avenue from "J" parking to "F" commercial district be denied.

When the Planning Board recommended the existing zoning at their meeting of July 1965 they stated:

"These modifications would enable the petitioner to expand his operation but guard against:

Undesirable reduction of adequate off-street parking accommodations.

Development which could result in the city's inability to expand Washington Avenue to secondary thoroughfare standards."

This zoning request would reduce the amount of "J" parking by 8,200 sq. feet and increase the amount of "F" commercial by the same amount. The total amount of

"F" commercial would then be 23,800 sq. feet or approximately 50% of the parcel creating a 1:1 parking ratio which is undesirable for a shopping center of this type.

The Board believes that the existing zoning allows reasonable development of this land, allowing for future widening of Miller Road and South Washington, and will prevent the over-development of this site.

The existing commercial zoning is adequate to serve the needs of this area as presently developed and in the future.

Mr. Reynolds mentioned that across the road there is a tract of land zoned commercial. Maybe this should be rezoned back. The staff advised that these structures are close to the intersection.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-93-66

Motion by Heino, seconded by Fink that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Keith Hamilton to rezone a parcel at 5436 S. Cedar Street from "F" commercial to "H" light industrial district be denied.

The Board believes that the previous study and recommendation under (Z-102-65) is valid, and is given further support by the proposed extension of Redner St. west, which will be developed with residential homes. This residential development plan is now before the Planning Board for consideration.

There are approximately 112 acres of open land in the vicinity of this parcel. The potential and the future plan indicates that this development should be residential.

A large part of the area is undeveloped and should be reserved for residential uses. Further spot zoning for non-residential uses will weaken the commercial complex at the Jolly-Cedar Intersection; will detract from the residential potential of the underdeveloped land and will by the process of attrition surround and strangle the school site to the north.

Industrial and commercial uses adjacent to residential is detrimental to both.

Sporadic building tends to cut off access to interior land.

Strip commercial development along major streets reduce the traffic carrying capacity of the streets.

Mr. Reynolds stated, "with a setback on Cedar Street, he should be able to operate an auto repair." The Zoning Committee

then pointed out that the garage on this property has been rented to someone else and this petitioner is now asking for another for his own use.

Mr. Gaus asked the proposed usage along Cedar Street and the Director advised the Board's actions to date.

Some discussion was held on a zoning policy.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Manz and Siebert—6.

Nays: Gaus and Reynolds—2.

Z-94-66

Motion by Heino, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by James and Mary O'Laughlin to rezone a parcel at 6026 S. Logan St. from "A" residential to "G-2" wholesale district be denied.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as low density residential.

The Master Plan proposes a concentration of commercial further south and closer to the intersection of Logan and Miller Roads.

The proposed change would affect property values in the area, and deter the improvement or development of adjacent properties in accord with existing one family requirements. This is especially true if the properties are converted to some less desirous commercial or wholesale use.

The change would definitely affirm strip commercial into this area, and would make further requests of this nature difficult to control or deny.

Strip commercial developments along major streets reduces the traffic carrying capacity and detracts from the planned commercial centers.

The affirming of commercial use in this area would jeopardize the safety of those attending the Maple Grove Elementary School to the southeast.

The pedestrian over-pass serving the school leads directly into this commercial development.

It has been the past policy of the Board to discourage strip commercial development along South Logan Street.

Proper zoning of the property would be medium density residential (8-9 families per acre).

This area requires a service road parallel to Logan Street, thus protecting the residences from adverse affects of traffic and

promoting the traffic carrying function of Logan Street.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz and Siebert—7.

Nays: Reynolds—1.

Z-95-66

Motion by Heino, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Arthur H. Klepper to rezone a parcel at 739 N. Cedar St. from "C" two family to "H" industrial district be denied.

The use is contrary to the established land use pattern in the immediate areas.

The change would adversely affect property values in the vicinity. This is especially true if the use is allowed to expand to overcrowd the parcel, or some other obnoxious use were to occupy the site.

Recent studies of the area show the redevelopment of this site and the immediate area for multi-family use.

It is not impossible to find adequate sites for the proposed use in districts permitting such use.

Mr. Manz asked if the petitioner could carry on his business without the rezoning, and was informed the building was condemned and he cannot rebuild. The property recently changed hands.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-97-66

Motion by Heino, seconded by Siebert that the petition by Erwin Dale Mulder to rezone 2933 N. East St. and vacant north and adjacent to described as:

The North 42 ft. of Lot 2, Supervisor's Plat of Community Home Sites, Lansing Township, Ingham County, Michigan. All that part of Lot 3 of Supervisors Plat of Community Home Sites of a part of the S.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the N.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 4, T4N, R2W, Lansing Township, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one family to "F" commercial district be tabled until the next meeting so the developer can submit site plans.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-98-66

Motion by Heino, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Harry Feguer to rezone a parcel at 3300 block W. Holmes Rd. described as:

Lots number 1-2-27 of proposed Newport Estates

from "A" one family to "C" two family district be denied.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as low density residential.

The established land use pattern in this area is single family residential.

The properties are so located that the structures can be oriented to the interior residential. (Lawdor Road).

This change of zoning would create an isolated district, and encourage other developers to seek the same privilege, for similar properties throughout the city.

The properties east of this site were zoned "C" two family because they were oriented directly to Holmes Road and would front the rear of the properties to the south.

Mr. Reynolds asked if this were a grocery store and was informed that it is not.

Mr. Gaus mentioned that there are duplexes in the area, and asked what difference does it make where the houses face?

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-99-66

Motion by Heino, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Arthur H. Klepper for Ed's Refinery Station to rezone a parcel at 6046 S. Logan and 6030 S. Logan from "A" residential to "G-2" wholesale warehouse district be denied.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as low density (2-3 dwelling units per net acre).

The proposed change would affect property values in the area, and deter the improvement or development of adjacent properties in accord with existing one family requirements. This is especially true if the properties are converted to some less desirous commercial use.

The change would definitely introduce strip commercial into this area, and would make further requests of this nature difficult to control or deny.

Strip commercial developments along major streets reduce the traffic carrying capacity and detract from the planned commercial centers.

The expansion of commercial use in this area would jeopardize the safety of those attending the Maple Grove Elementary School to the southeast.

It has been the past policy of the Board to discourage strip commercial development along South Logan Street.

Proper zoning of the property would be medium density residential (8-9 families per acre) with a service road parallel to Logan Street, thus protecting the residences from adverse effects of traffic and promoting the traffic carrying function of Logan Street.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Siebert—6.

Nays: Manz and Reynolds—2.

Z-100-66

Motion by Heino, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by A. Z. Breen to rezone a parcel in the 5000 Block S. Pennsylvania Avenue described as:

Lots 33 and 34 of Pleasant Ridge Sub-division

from "C" two family to "D-M" multiple district be denied.

The predominant established use is single family homes.

There has been and is a shortage of family type homes throughout the area.

Change of zoning would create an opportunity to overcrowd the land: (1000 square foot of lot area per dwelling unit would allow 17 dwelling units on this site platted for two families).

Present city standards for parking are inadequate to cope with needs created by apartment development. Any development greater than two family on lots of this type create community problems related to inadequate parking, recreation space, plus excessive activity that produces noise and dirt detrimental to single family environment.

The Planning Board did not approve the "D-M" multiple zoning north of this site. This was governmental action beyond the Planning Board.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: Manz—1.

Z-101-66

Motion by Heino, seconded by Manz that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by William C. Hines for Sun Oil Company to rezone a parcel at 5100 S. Pennsylvania from "A" one family to "F" commercial district be denied as filed and that the property be zoned "E-2" drive-in district.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as low density residential.

Strip commercial development along major streets should be discouraged wherever possible, as it reduces the traffic carrying capacity and detracts from planned commercial centers.

The change of zoning to "F" commercial would allow additional commercial uses on the site in addition to a service station.

The Board believes it is reasonable that the service station should be made conforming as it is existing and this use will no doubt remain at this location. The granting of "F" commercial opens this corner up to additional commercial uses which could be detrimental to the surrounding area. The "E-2" drive-in-shop district would make the service station conforming while at the same time prevent the introduction of other commercial uses on this site.

Mr. Reynolds asked if they are zoned "E-2" can they sell boats, and was informed that they can not.

Mr. Gaus asked if this would upgrade this area if this were zoned commercial and mentioned that he thought two stations were vacant now. The staff stated the field check showed that all four were operating again.

Mr. Manz asked if the barber shop is non-conforming and was informed that it is. This was built before this area came into the city.

The Director asked the chief of the Current Planning section if he thought a recommendation should be made on the pieces of property to the south and Mr. Church stated that he did not desire to do this as the uses could change.

Some discussion was held, and it was the consensus that the staff should make a recommendation at a later date, starting at the barber shop and going south to Sims Court, as to the most applicable zoning for this area.

Mr. Reynolds stated that he would like to recommend the same for across the street also.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: Black and Gaus—2.

Z-102-66

Motion by Heino, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Robert L. Freeman and Robert W. Smith to rezone a parcel at 900 N. Capitol Avenue from "D-M" multiple dwelling to "D-1" professional offices district be denied.

This would constitute a "spot zone" inconsistent with the existing "D-M" zoning of this section of North Capitol Avenue.

The Master Land Use Plan shows this area for residential development.

The size of the parcel (66 ft. x 62 ft.) is not adequate for an office use with required off-street parking. The drawing submitted by the petitioner shows four off-street parking spaces in the required front yard.

The office use is not compatible with the predominate residential nature of the neighborhood.

The basic land use conditions have not changed in this area, therefore there are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be used under the existing zoning.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-103-66

Motion by Heino, seconded by Siebert that the petition by St. Michael's Episcopal Church to rezone a parcel at 2709 Eifert Road from "A" one family to "B" one family be tabled for thirty days.

A letter is to be sent to the petitioner with a copy to St. Paul's Episcopal Church, informing them of the tabling.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-104-66

Motion by Heino, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Velmer Croteau to rezone a parcel at 1201 N. Larch Street from "F" commercial to "H" light industrial district be granted.

This rezoning would make the existing use conforming.

"H" light industrial zoning is located to the immediate north and two other "H" districts are located within 320 ft. of this property.

Two "I" heavy industrial districts are located in the immediate vicinity.

This rezoning would encourage use of this land that could become vacant if not rezoned.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gauz, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-105-66

Motion by Heino, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Hannibal S. Aboud to rezone parcels at 725-729 North Logan and 1118 Rose Court described as:

Lots 1, 2, 3 and 6, Block 2, McPhersons Saginaw Street Addition

from "B" one family to "J" parking district be granted except

The East 10 feet of Lot No. 1

remain in its present zoning classification.

The Board further recommends that:

Lots 4 and 5, Block 2, McPhersons Saginaw Street Addition

be rezoned from "B" one family to "J" parking district.

Land use changes in this area has made this block less desirable for residential use.

Mr. Gaus questioned why 4 and 5 were being recommended for rezoning and was informed that this would make them consistent with the rest of the area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Abstain: Reynolds—1.

Z-106-66

Motion by Heino, seconded by Siebert that the petition by The Michigan Conference of the Evangelical United Brethren Church to rezone a parcel at 5438 S. Pennsylvania Avenue from "A" residential to "D-1" professional district be tabled for thirty days to allow the staff time to make a detailed analysis of the area.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-107-66

Motion by Heino, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Rev. J. B. Manning, Pastor of the New Home Missionary Baptist

Church to rezone a parcel at 3133 Pleasant Grove Road from "A" one family residence to "B" one family and "J" parking district be granted as follows:

Commencing 826 ft. north of the S.W. corner of Section 29, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, thence east 158 ft., thence north 140 ft. thence west 158 ft. thence south to point of beginning

be rezoned from "A" one family to "B" one family and

The balance of the property

be rezoned from "A" one family to "J" parking district, with screening to be provided along the north and south lines of the "J" parking except for a 25 ft. setback on Pleasant Grove Road.

Screening to consist of one of the following:

A 5 ft. high dense privet hedge.

A 4 ft. high decorative masonry wall.

A 3 ft. high chain link fence with dense evergreen plantings of a mature height of 5 ft. to 5 ft. 6 in., or

any other type of screening that may be suggested by the property owners, with the approval of the Planning Department.

The screening shall also apply to the east line of the "J" parking district when the land is developed.

The requested change would make the existing use conforming and allow the petitioner to repair an unsightly condition.

The proposed rezoning would upgrade the site by requiring paving of parking areas and proper screening around the perimeter of the site.

The proposed change would not adversely influence living conditions in the area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-108-66

Motion by Heino, seconded by Siebert that the petition by Jay H. Raines to rezone a parcel at 5723 S. Waverly Road from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be tabled for thirty days to allow the staff sufficient time to investigate the exempted property and determine the possible effect it may have on the site petitioned for rezoning.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-109-66

Motion by Heino, seconded by Siebert that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Dean and Harris of Lansing to rezone a parcel at 416 E. Grand River Avenue from "F-1" commercial to "H" light industrial district be granted as filed subject to the

Entire Lot 9 and the East 33 ft. of Lot 8, Block 14, Original Plat, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

being rezoned from "H" light industrial to "J" parking district.

The Planning Board finds that necessary off-street parking in the area is critical and that this recommendation would help preserve the area now being used for parking.

The site is located within an industrial corridor indicated in the Master Land Use Plan. A change of zoning would allow continuance of a use that has existed for many years and which otherwise might remain vacant.

The Board does not believe the proposed change would adversely influence living conditions within the area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

STREETS COMMITTEE

S-10-66F

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black that the preliminary Plat of Mary Ann Meadows be approved subject to the following conditions:

Utility easements shall be provided as required by the Board of Water and Light and by the Board of Public Service.

Financial security shall be provided by the developer to cover the plat's share of any public facilities that will be extended to serve this area.

All other requirements of the Michigan State Plat Act as amended shall comply.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black that the final Plat of Mary Ann Meadows be approved and recommends that it be approved by City Council subject to:

The posting of financial security in the amount of:

| | |
|--------------------------------|------------|
| Monument deposit | \$ 80.00 |
| Curb and Gutter | 760.00 |
| Storm and Sanitary Sewer | 1,480.00 |
| Total | \$2,320.00 |

prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

Storm sewer and curb and gutter deposit shall be applied to the plat's share of these public improvements when they become available.

All other requirements of the Michigan State Plat Act 172, Public Acts of 1929 as amended shall apply.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

S-7-62F4K

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black that the final plat of Kimberly Downs No. 4 be approved and recommends that it be approved by City Council subject to the following conditions:

All public improvements shall be installed with complete public utilities including water, sanitary sewers, storm sewers and full street improvements including street paving, curb and gutter, sidewalks and such other improvements as required under Section VI D of Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

The posting of financial security in the amount of:

| | |
|--------------------------------|-------------|
| Monument Deposit | \$ 420.00 |
| Street Grade and Gravel | 3,200.00 |
| Storm and Sanitary Sewer | 23,500.00 |
| TOTAL | \$27,120.00 |

prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

All other standards and requirements of the Michigan State Plat Act, Act 172, Public Act of 1929 as amended shall apply.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

S-15-65F

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black that the Final Plat of Harshman Subdivision be disapproved and recommends that it be disapproved by City Council due to the following reasons:

Lot No. 4 of Harshman Subdivision overlaps some 17 feet into Lots No. 1 of Village Green Subdivision and Lot No. 129 of the proposed Village Green No. 1.

The plat will be reconsidered when positive ownership of its boundaries can be presented by means of a Policy of Title Insurance statement.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

S-17-65F

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black that the Final Plat of Richfield Park be approved

and recommends that it be approved by City Council subject to the following conditions:

All public improvements shall be installed with complete public utilities including water, sanitary sewers, storm sewers and full street improvements including street paving, curb and gutter, sidewalks and such other improvements as required under Section VI D of Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

The posting of financial security in the amount of:

Monument Deposit\$400.00

prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

All other standards and requirements of the Michigan State Plat Act, Act 172, Public Act of 1929 as amended shall apply.

Mr. Thomas W. Newton, Planner gave an explanation of Lot 79 being paved for the extension of Richwood Ave.

Mr. Black asked if the lot had been dedicated to the city and he was informed that one of the recommendations of approval will contain this.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

ROW-20-66

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz that the Board recommend after considering the petition to vacate the alley between Vermont and Illinois in the 1300 Block of E. North Street that the request be approved subject to the approval of the City Attorney.

The alley has never been developed and dead ends after about 244 ft. All city departments and public utilities approve the vacation and have no requirements as to easements. The Board believes there is no reason to retain it.

Mr. Manz asked if there are any easements, and Mr. Church stated that there were no requirements for any by any city department or any of the public utilities.

Mr. Fink asked if the abutting property owners would share the alley.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. Reynolds stated that the Redevelopment Board has recommended that a letter

be sent by City Council concerning Eagles and Mac's, assuring them that their positions can possibly be incorporated in the Urban Renewal Area.

Johnson, Johnson and Roy have started the mall design, and will welcome the Boards recommendations.

ORDINANCE

Mr. Black advised that the Zoning Ordinance has been final typed. Copies of the Zoning Ordinance will be issued and a meeting is to be called before July 19th to review this and recommend adoption at the July 19th meeting, if possible.

Mr. Black then invited the Board to a buffet at his home at 5:30 P.M. on July 19th.

PLANNING DIRECTORS REPORT

The Secretary read a letter received from Mr. Clyde Williams of the AFL-CIO Labor Staff Representative asking that Mr. Guernsey serve as a resource person Monday, July 25 and all day on Tuesday, July 26th.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Manz that the secretary be authorized to attend at his own discretion.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Director requested that Mr. Edwin P. Brown be authorized to attend the American Institute of Planners Conference in Portland, Oregon.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Gaus that Mr. Brown be authorized to attend.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

A letter of resignation has been received from Robert L. Rizzuti who is leaving for Olean, New York on July 14th. Also, one has been received from Mr. Thomas W. Newton who is leaving for Redwood City, California on July 27th. This will leave the department with four positions unfilled.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Gaus had no report on the presentation of gavel and certificates to former board members.

Meeting adjourned at 12:10 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

T/C

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, July 19, 1966

Meeting called to order by Chairman
Ramona J. Bretz at 7:40 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus,
Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Absent: None.

HEARINGS

S-11-66P

Mr. Thomas W. Newton gave an explanation of the preliminary plat of the Keegan property in the 1500 Block of North Waverly Road. The surrounding property is in the township. The developer proposes to plat for single family use.

The developer was not present.

Mr. Black asked what the relative size of the proposed lots in relation to the existing lots in the adjacent subdivisions, and was informed they were quite similar, being approximately 80 ft. by 200 ft. They are well over the city's minimum.

Mr. Reynolds asked if the people who were involved in the prior Community Unit Plan were involved in this plat, and was informed that they were not. The land owners were requesting this plat.

Mr. Siebert asked if the lower part of the subdivision had been coordinated with the township and was informed that the public hearing was being held simultaneously by the city and the township. The township supervisor is aware of the plat.

Mr. Fink stated that there might be a problem if the subdivision is approved by the Board and the Council and not by the township.

Mr. Fink questioned the use of the flood plain and was informed that Mr. Keegan proposed to use the low land for open space. He feels that it is unique that developers are becoming aware of flood plain areas. He feels that the Board should commend the developer, that he should recognize the need.

Mr. Eric Windfuhr of 3537 Tecumseh River Drive, stated that he was opposed to the previous proposed apartment plan, but that the present plans look OK.

Further discussion followed.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

S-1-66P

Mr. Thomas W. Newton presented the plans for the proposed single family development of Decker Subdivision on Redner Street.

Mr. Floyd Decker stated that he is hoping to extend the north-south street to Stafford Road and the Everett High School.

Mr. Fink asked if he had a proposed name for the north-south street and Mr. Decker suggested following through with Stafford name if it does connect.

Mr. Newton stated that there was some thought for swinging the street so that it could be a frontage for the proposed junior high school.

Mr. Reynolds asked if the request for light industry on the corner of Redner and S. Cedar would have an effect on the proposed development and was informed that it would hurt the development.

Mr. Decker stated that he would be very much opposed to the light industrial zoning and that he didn't know that it had been proposed. Feels that the junk cars should be screened.

Further discussion followed.

Mr. Fink stated that the Council has the power to supercede the Board's recommendation. He feels that the Board should recommend to the Council that we have a desirable plat pending to the interior of Cedar Street. This should fortify the Board's recommendation of denial of light industrial to the north of Redner St. Send the communication directly to the Zoning Committee of Council. Mr. Fink moved, seconded by Siebert that we send a letter to the Zoning Committee of Council that the land should be retained in its present zoning characteristics.

Mr. Decker stated that he would have no objections if this property would stay industrial so long as the property is cleaned up and the junk cars were disposed of and the area be fenced.

Motion carried by majority vote, Mr. Gaus dissenting.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

S-12-66P

Mr. Thomas gave an explanation of the plat.

Mr. Fink wanted a brief review of the Community Unit Plan for the density of the land area and was informed that it was approximately nine units per acre with the higher density located near the intersection and decreasing the density to two-family units to the east of the property. Anything beyond the two-family duplexes would be single family. Sanitary sewers are available at the present time and the storm sewers will be available in approximately nine months and can handle these densities but no more.

Mr. Gaus wanted to know whether the property to the east was Our Savior Lutheran or was that farther away, and was informed that the church was further away.

Mr. Black wanted to know the street width and was informed that it was a 66 foot right-of-way with 36 foot pavement to Lot No. 1 and No. 9 from the east boundary of the plat. North from Lot No. 1 and No. 9 to Holmes Road is a 60 ft. right-of-way because the developer is unable to obtain the other 6 feet. The street will end in a temporary cul-de-sac.

Mr. Siebert wanted to know the total number of units and was informed that there were 84.

Verne Thornton of 2042 Ferroll, wanted to know if this was to be a low income housing project and was informed "No." She wanted to know what was to be done with the 8 foot strip at the rear of the property where it touches the property fronting on Ferroll.

Mr. John Buck, of 3525 Pleasant Grove, stated that this 8 foot of land runs along the south side of his property which extends from Lot No. 2 up to Pleasant Grove Road.

Mrs. Althel Bower of 2104 Ferroll also borders on the 8 ft. strip. She stated that a large tree from this strip has fallen across her property and she would like it removed.

Mr. Wayne Davis of 1932 Ferroll wanted to know about fencing. He was informed that the entire length will be screened.

There will be no fencing required for the duplex because of their similarity to the houses in the area.

Mr. John Buck wondered if there would be fencing on the west side and was informed that there would be fencing all along the property line.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

Meeting was recessed from 8:23 to 9:12 P.M.

BUSINESS SESSION

It was moved by Mr. Gaus seconded by Mr. Heino that the minutes of May 24, June 7, and 21, and July 5 be approved.

Mr. Black proposed corrections in the minutes of June 7 and June 21. In the June 7th minutes on page 3, next to the last paragraph, "the building will be set inside pavement:" should read "in a sea of pavement" and that the next sentence should read that "There will be nothing but pavement on three sides." This then agrees with the statement at the top of page four.

In the minutes of June 21 on the second page in the comment of Mr. Ackley he is quoted as saying that "without additional space their program is not conventional." This should be corrected before it is sent to Council.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Mr. Guernsey gave an explanation of the zoning process.

Z-60-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Keith B. Granger and Dr. Edw. Reynolds to rezone a parcel at 5334 South Cedar St. described as:

Beginning at a point 684.6 feet South and 764.0 feet East of the North $\frac{1}{4}$ corner of Section 4, T3N, R2W thence East 554.35 feet to center of Highway US 127 (Cedar Street), thence South 858.5 feet along the center of said Highway US 127, thence West 556 feet, thence North 858.5 feet to point of beginning, and subject to easements and restrictions of record,

from "D" apartment to "F" commercial district be denied.

The Planning Board further recommends that the portion of the property now zoned "D" apartment district described as:

Beginning at a point 1040.6 ft. S. and 764.0 ft. E. of the N. $\frac{1}{4}$ corner Section 4, T3N, R2W, thence E. 554.35 ft. to the center of highway U.S. 127 (Cedar St.) thence S. 502.5 ft. along the center of said highway U.S. 127 thence W. 556 ft. thence N. 502.5 ft. to the point of beginning, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, except the East 225 ft. and the South 80 ft.,

be rezoned from "D" apartment to "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

"D" apartment zoning allows a density and building height that would be contrary to outlying apartment development.

"D-M" multiple zoning would allow structural development that would be more in keeping with the development in the area, and discourage over development without adequate open space and off-street parking.

Multiple development at this location would help supplement the existing and potential commercial development in the area.

Mr. Reynolds wanted to know whether the "A" one residential would remain the same and was informed that it would.

Mr. Fink asked if the center strip would remain "F" commercial and was informed that it would.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-111-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Fink that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the subject property be zoned "F" commercial and that the property west of this site described as:

Lots 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, except that portion of Lots 9 and 10 now zoned "E-2" drive-in shop described as:

Commencing as a point 31 ft. north of S.W. corner of East 3 rods of Lot 10, Block 7 of Bush Butler and Sparrow's Addition to Lansing, Michigan and running thence east 5 rods, thence north 2 rods, west 5 rods, south 2 rods on east half of S.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 17, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

Commencing at a point 64 feet north of S.W. corner of the east 3 rods of Lot 10, Block 7, Bush, Butler and Sparrow's

Addition to Lansing, Michigan thence east 5 rods, north 68 feet, west 5 rods, south 68 feet

be rezoned from "C" two family to "F" commercial district.

The proposed rezoning west of the subject property would abut existing residential development on St. Joseph St. presently zoned commercial where as the property east of the site to Butler Blvd. would be contiguous to the existing commercial development on St. Joseph St.

The rezoning could possibly increase the value of the property and discourage the small business man from developing.

The south half of this block is presently zoned commercial and not fully developed. This area should be utilized to its maximum before additional properties are rezoned.

Mr. Black asked what happened to the parcel to the east which may also be "F" commercial.

Mr. Fink stated that, in the future, this whole area could be subject to commercial, but they would rather wait to see the development in the area that has been recommended as "F" commercial before they rezone the entire block.

Mr. Black indicated that the east half of the block, instead of the west half, should be rezoned. He stated that the properties which now face on St. Joseph on the north half of the block are now commercial. There are still a lot of houses on St. Joseph and what the Committee proposes would put commercial behind residential.

Mr. Fink stated that there is an "E-2" use at the corner of Hillsdale and Logan and that the Committee used this as sort of an anchor point.

Mr. Manz wondered about the future Logan-Butler one-way pair and was informed that the cut-off would be north of Hillsdale.

Mr. Gaus wondered if we weren't giving the west side residents a greater bargaining power as far as sale of their property is concerned, over those on the east side.

Mr. Fink stated that most of the west side ownership was absentee.

Mr. Gaus stated that rather than zone one parcel or half the block that they should rezone all of it. Then he referred to the rezoning of two parcels on North Capitol Avenue and the fact that the Planning Board also rezoned the rest of the block.

Motion failed by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Heino, Seibert—4.

Nays: Black, Gaus, Manz and Reynolds—4.

Therefore, the Board notified City Council that they made no recommendation on the petition by Rev. Andrew G. Gill to rezone a parcel at 925 W. Hillsdale Street described as:

W. 44 ft. of Lot 5, of Block 7 of Bush, Butler and Sparrow Addition to the City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "C" two family to "E" apartment shop district.

Z-188-65

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the relocation of the proposed elementary school site within the proposed community development of the Kahres Farm project be approved.

The Walter Neller Co. has offered to consider the relocation of the existing school site from the south side of proposed Edgewood Blvd. to be located north of the boulevard.

The size of the proposed school and park site has been revised from approximately 8 acres to 17 acres (proposed as a trade by the Neller Co.)

The new location of the site is more centrally located to the proposed residential development and will be separated from the boulevard by residential homes if Edgewood Blvd. is to be located as planned (the city would have to purchase additional right-of-way.)

The revised plan indicates that there may be additional multiple development requested.

Additional review when the plan is firmed up will be required as to the extent of the multiple family development and open space required as related to population estimates.

Mr. Manz asked where the right-of-way would be.

Mr. Reynolds stated that the previous problem was in crossing the road.

Mr. Fink stated that it has been the policy of the Board to recommend that a park be developed along with the school. A further extension of this policy is commendable. He went on to say that the Board is aware of the rezoning of the church. He feels that the Board should go on record to encourage cooperation between the developer and the church for relocation.

Mr. Heino seconded this proposal.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

STREETS COMMITTEE

S-6-66F

Moved by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds that the Planning Board at their meeting on July 19, 1966 approved the final plat of Potomac Park and recommends that it be approved by City Council subject to the following conditions:

All public improvements shall be installed with complete public utilities including water, sanitary sewers, storm sewers and full street improvements including street paving, curb and gutter, sidewalks and such other improvements as required under Section VI D of Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

The posting of financial security, as outlined in Section VI D Lansing Subdivision Regulations in the amount of:

Monument Deposit

| | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|
| 22 at \$20.00 ea. | \$ 440.00 |
| Storm and Sanitary Sewers | 27,900.00 |
| Street Grade and Gravel | 2,400.00 |
| TOTAL | \$30,740.00 |

prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

All other standards and requirements of the Michigan State Plat Act, Act 172, Public Acts of 1929, as amended, shall apply.

Motion approved by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: Manz—1.

S-12-66P

Moved by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds that the preliminary plat of Simken Village be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Final plat should be developed with all public improvements as required by the Michigan State Plat Act and Lansing Subdivision Regulations.
2. Construction and improvement drawings should be submitted and approved prior to approval of final plat.
3. All required easements should be recorded on the face of the final plat.
4. All lots should be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.
5. Street pavement width should be 36 ft. Right-of-way should be 66 ft. from the north line of lots 1 and 9 to the east boundary of the plat.

6. This approval shall be valid for a period of one year from the date of Planning Board Action. Expiration date is Wednesday, July 19, 1967.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

ROW-21-66

Moved by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds, that after considering the request of Frank Hudcosky for the purchase of

Outlet "A" of Supervisors Plat of Burchfield Subdivision

located at 3442 Burchfield Street. That the request be denied until such time that it is determined what portions of the property is needed for necessary utility easements.

Before this property is considered for public sale, it should be made certain that the law does not require that it revert to the adjacent property owners.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

SS-17-64

Moved by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds, that the Board review the preliminary plans for the extension of Aurelius Rd. from Mt. Hope Avenue north to the south end of the structure carrying Clemens Ave. extended over I-496, and recommends that the plans as presented be accepted as to the location, character and extent.

In considering the preliminary plans prepared by consulting engineer, G. J. Mc-Lravy & Sons, Inc. show that 48 foot wide four lane street that will tie in with a bridge over the depressed I-496 expressway at Clemens Ave., they show the road extending northward from Mt. Hope Ave. for 800 ft. on the centerline of Aurelius Rd., then veering slightly to the east across the east end of Potter Park to tie in with Clemens Ave.

Straightening of the Red Cedar River bed is proposed in the vicinity of this extension. The road would cross over the Grand Trunk. North of the Grand Trunk RR the proposed ROW extends into property of the Board of Water and Light, which extends to the east of Clemens Ave.

The south end of the approach which will carry Clemens over I-496 is located approx-

imately half way between Perkins and Walsh Street. The consideration before the Planning Board at this time extends approximately 3,450 ft. north from the Mt. Hope Avenue ROW to this point.

The Planning Board at their meeting of October 6, 1964 recommended that Aurelius Rd. extension should continue north from its origin at Mt. Hope Avenue until it crossed I-496 and then turn west to connect with Shepard St. with the intention of future improvements of Marshall St. and an eventual connection with Wood St. to provide a north-south through street on the east side of the city.

The route proposed agrees with the previous recommendation of the Planning Board for this section of the proposed extension. The Public Service Department and the Parks and Recreation Department have no objection to the plan.

Motion carried by unanimous vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

BUILDING AND PROPERTIES COMMITTEE

SS-3-66

Moved by Manz, seconded by Black, that recent requests for rezoning north of Mt. Hope and east of the proposed Aurelius Road Extension within the City of Lansing prompted the Planning Board to undertake a detailed analysis of the area. This analysis is contained in the accompanying report, "Red Cedar Basin Park Proposal."

In keeping with the recommendations of the 1921, 1938 and 1958 Master Plan, and our letter forwarded to you on July 29, 1965 recommending purchase of the flood plain and after further review and consideration of present and desirable future land use for the area, the Planning Board reviews its recommended past policies and makes the following specific recommendations:

1. That the area within the Red Cedar River flood plain bordered by Aurelius Road Extension and the Red Cedar River on the east, C & O railroad to the north, Pinetree connector to the west and Mt. Hope Avenue on the south, be purchased by the city for park development. Furthermore, to immediately submit an application to the Federal Government for open space funds to offset local costs of land acquisition.
2. That immediate steps be taken to develop and effectuate a city ordinance controlling cut and fill within the flood plain of the Grand, Red Cedar and Sycamore Rivers in the City of Lansing and reaffirm past zoning policies of

maintaining low density residential and not encourage commercial and heavy industrial uses on this land.

In the process of gathering information for this study new possibilities for the use of borrow pits as recreational land were examined. The Board believes that a study of existing borrow and gravel pits should be done with emphasis on the possible utilization of these pits for recreational use upon completion of the extracting process.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE

Mr. Reynolds reported that the Federal agency has concurred with density of the 100 Block of North Washington Ave., in regards to the motor hotel, office building and department store. The Board is interviewing consulting architects. Four men have showed an interest, and two have interviewed to date.

Mr. Fink questioned the Mall development program.

Mr. Reynolds stated that Johnson, Johnson and Roy have submitted two preliminary drawings.

Further discussion followed.

ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. Black reported that there have been a few more changes in the revised Ordinance. The staff is now to finalize the text of the Ordinance and transmit it to the Board. The legal council has not completed his review. When the maps that accompany the Ordinance are complete then along with legal review, will be transmitted to Council. This should be some time in September.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Reviewed the staff progress report. Mr. Fink asked about the Community Renewal Program.

Discussed the meetings that were attended by the staff.

Mr. Guernsey, reported on staffing. We are acquiring three or four junior and senior students in Landscape Architecture to work in our Drafting Section. Taking one or two of the fellows who are now working in the drafting section and shifting them to help the Current Planning Section.

The tentative Achievement Reports were circulated. It was suggested that the report be considered by the Board at the regular August meeting.

The Central City Report is nearly complete. Johnson, Johnson and Roy is being consulted on their preliminary sketches for the mall.

OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

A letter was received from Herbert Sheathelm, of the Lansing Board of Education, thanking the staff and the Board for their cooperation in working with the school board. All future communication will be directed to Mr. Russell Schneider.

A letter was received from the Michigan Municipal League asking Mr. Guernsey to attend as a resource person at their workshop conference in September.

It was moved by Manz, seconded by Siebert, that Mr. Guernsey be authorized to take part in the conference.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

NEW BUSINESS

Z-88-66

A letter was received from the Granger Construction Company, relative to the zoning petition in the 3000 Blk. N. East Street. They wish to amend the petition and asked that the Board reconsider a curb cut on N. East Street. There were no curb cuts allowed on US 127. It was recommended that there be both ingress and egress both by the north and to the south. Feels that the recommendation should stand.

Mr. Black wanted to know if the sign was tied in with the curb cut.

Motion by Mr. Siebert, seconded by Reynolds, that the Board recommend to City Council that the request from Keith Granger, Granger Construction Company, asking that the Planning Board reconsider their previous recommendation regarding the zoning and curb cuts on the property located in the 3000 Block of N. East Street described as:

Lots 7 through 16 inclusive of the Elmore M. Hunt Subdivision. A portion of the South $\frac{1}{2}$ of the S.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 3, T4N, R2W, Lansing Township, Ingham County, Michigan

from "F" commercial and "J" parking to "F" commercial district be denied.

The Planning Board believes that their previous recommendation which would discourage ingress and egress directly off N.

East St. to the site was reasonable. In reaffirming this action the Board considered the high volumes of fast moving traffic, and numerous curb cuts that now exist along this area of N. East Street.

The Board further recommends that, that portion of the property described as:

Commencing 104 ft. south of the N.W. corner of the property thence east 10 ft., thence south 6 ft., thence west 10 ft. thence North 6 ft. to beginning

be zoned "F" commercial for the purpose of erecting an identification sign.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-174-65

Moved by Mr. Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the amendment to the Community Unit Plan of Hallmark Estates by Joemax Smith at the Northeast corner of Moores River Drive and Mt. Hope Avenue requesting the addition of one apartment to the presently authorized 81 units, be approved as requested.

The topography of the site will allow this unit to be placed within the approved dimensions of the proposed building, without altering the lot coverage of the structure or decreasing the size of the units within the structure. The Board believes that this change will not distract from the overall plan or affect the surrounding properties.

All conditions of the previous approval shall be complied with.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Mr. Gauz moved, seconded by Black, that certificates be presented to all Board members and that gavels be issued to all members who have served as Chairman.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Meeting adjourned at 10:28 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

C/M

The President thereupon declared motion carried.

After discussion, a motion was introduced by Commissioner Owen, supported by Commissioner Patterson that meetings every other week be continued until such time as the President or the Director deem it necessary to hold meetings more often.

Upon roll call the "Ayes" and "Nays" were as follows:

Ayes: Commissioner Blackall, Oliver, Owen, Patterson—4.

Nays: None.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM MATEER,
Housing Director.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, August 2, 1966

Meeting called to order at 7:35 P.M. by Chairman Ramona J. Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Black, Bretz, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Absent: Fink—1.

HEARINGS

Z-112-66

Mr. Donald Miles appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 3413 West Jolly Road, from "A" one family residential to Community Unit Plan, revised to "D-M" multiple by letter of July 25, 1966. Mr. Miles presented a petition from the surrounding property owners, together with a basic drawing of what he proposes to develop on the property. He plans 18 residential units. He further added that the area is somewhat run down.

Mr. Reynolds asked if the petition from the people on Wexford Road were in favor of this development, and was advised that they are. Mr. Reynolds asked if they understand what the petitioner wanted to develop on the property and advised that they do.

Mr. Fink asked if Mr. Miles would have any objections to submitting a plan for Community Unit, and the petitioner advised that he had talked to the staff after originally submitting a Community Unit Plan and the staff recommended the "D-M"

request. Mr. Fink then commented on the increase of density permitted under the "D-M" compared to the Community Unit.

Mr. Fink asked for a unit breakdown, and was advised that the plans call for 12 two-bedroom and 6 one bedroom.

Mr. Siebert asked if there would be one entrance off Jolly Rd., and was advised that there would be two. The fire lane would come in from either way.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-127-66

Mr. John P. Williams appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 600 S. Logan street, from "E-1" drive-in shop to "F" commercial district, and was advised he did not wish to make any comments.

Mr. Black asked the proposed use of the property, and was informed that he wanted to use it for a dry cleaners.

The Secretary then asked if he was now in the path of I-496 and the petitioner answered "that's right."

Mr. Reynolds then asked if they just picked up the cleaning, and Mr. Williams stated that they do the complete cleaning work.

Mr. Reynolds then inquired if the light industrial zoning were needed and the Secretary advised that this would depend on the number of employees.

Mrs. Bretz asked the number of employees, and Mr. Williams stated that there would be his wife, another man and himself. Mr. Williams added that he has been unable to find another place and he must move by the fifteenth of this month.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Mr. Fink came in at 7:40 P.M.

Z-128-66

Mr. Leo Farhat, Attorney, appeared for Harold and Charlotte Gross and the Gross Telecasting, Inc. in behalf of the petition to rezone property in the 2800 Block of E. Saginaw Street described as:

Com. at In'n S. line E. Saginaw St. and N. and S. $\frac{1}{4}$ line Section 14 thence E'ly along S. line E. Saginaw St. 375 ft. S. pa'l to N. and S. $\frac{1}{4}$ line 480 ft., W'ly 375 ft. plus/minus point in N. and S. $\frac{1}{4}$ line 480 ft. S. of beg., N. to beg.; Section 14, T4N, R2W

Com. 375 ft. S. 89° 37' E. and 520 ft. S. 0° 18' W. of N. $\frac{1}{4}$ post Section 14 thence N. pa'l to N. and S. $\frac{1}{4}$ line 480 ft. to S. line E. Saginaw St., E'ly 172.64 ft. along S. line E. Saginaw St. to W. line Howard St., S'ly along W. line Howard St. 700 ft. N. 89° 54' 30" W. 549.80 ft. plus/minus to N. and S. $\frac{1}{4}$ line Section 14, N'ly along $\frac{1}{4}$ line to point 520 ft. S. and N. $\frac{1}{4}$ post Section 14, E'ly 375 ft. to beg.; Section 14, T4N, R2W

from "A" one family residential to "F" commercial district and called the Board's attention to the fact that there are four guy wires used on the tower so the entire area is used for commercial. Prior to annexation this area was in Lansing Township. WJIM is going into CATV field and it will be necessary to construct offices. Color TV needs to remain competitive with color broadcasts from their studios. They must expand their facilities which are too small for the business being conducted. The Gross's are trying to contact owners of properties to the East which has 172 foot frontage with 477 ft. depth which may be utilized for a commercial type building. This will conform with what they have on the site now. They anticipate a problem in relation to parking use of the parcel. It is impossible to determine the buildings now and therefore cannot state where the parking area will be. The guy wires will also create some problem. They want to protect the present building and will not build anything adjacent that is not compatible, and they will make sure there is adequate parking.

Mr. Siebert asked where the building would be located and Mr. Farhat stated that it would be facing north on Saginaw.

WJIM's present studios would be enlarged to the South.

Mr. Siebert then asked if there would be a second story and was advised there is none now and will not be any in the new structure.

Mr. Black inquired as to how much property was being talked about. Mr. Farhat explained that part of the land is owned by the studio and part by individuals for tax reasons.

Mr. Siebert asked about the insurance angle on the guy wires and wondered if they couldn't possibly be enclosed for parking of cars. Mr. Farhat stated he believed that some enclosing of the guy wires would be OK.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-129-66

Mr. L. A. Smith, Attorney, appeared for Mr. Geert Mulder, in behalf of the petition to rezone property in the 3400 Block of Burchfield Street described as:

Lots 9, 10, and 11, Outlot B, Supervisors Plat of Burchfield Subdivision, Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one family residential to "C" two family district. Mr. Smith stated that he wanted to point out that there is multiple housing to the south of the parcel in question. Mr. Smith mentioned that photos and other data had been presented to the Board on July 1st.

Mr. Fink asked if Lot 9 is large enough to meet the criteria for the "C" two family? The Secretary gave an explanation of the Board's recommendation to Council.

Mr. Smith informed that the units will meet building specifications. The petitioner would not be adverse to moving the lot lines to meet these requirements.

The Secretary reported that the property across the street is single family development, and the recently installed sanitary sewers were based single family. This development would double the density.

Mr. Smith further advised that any additional rezoning requests would be speculative. He stated he felt that any building would enhance the area. He does not have any information of pending rezonings. He stated he felt the present sewage would be adequate to accommodate the petition before the board.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-130-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 816 E. Howe Street from "A" one family to "H" light industrial district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-131-66

Mr. Robert Eastin representing Richard Peacock and Allen Parke appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 617 Seymour Avenue from "D-M" multiple to "D-1" professional offices district and advised that Mr. Peacock and Mr. Parke operate a business known as Capital Business Services, presently located at 301 N. Larch. The property is presently used as a one family home. They anticipate no structural changes. It is a large ten room brick home adequate for many years to come. Petitioners want to purchase the property subject to the rezoning, for an accounting office. They employ about 5 people besides themselves. There is plenty of off street parking and their business will not be bringing any people to this area. He stated he believed that this type of business would be more desirable than a rooming house. The present location of their business is in a building owned by the city behind the bus lines. They feel the city may want to use this property for the expansion of the bus line operation. The lot size of the Seymour property is 66 by 175 which would accommodate several cars.

Mr. Black stated that if both corners are used for professional use, there would be one house on the north and three houses on the south of this property and he wondered if these houses were one family. Mr. Eastin replied that he did not know the present use.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-132-66

Mrs. Betty M. Brennan, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 2801 N. East Street, from "A" one family residence to "C" two family district, and stated that she desires two family or commercial. She mentioned the small amount of single family homes in the area. Her neighbor has no objection. The highway has heavy traffic. She has enough parking and the house will easily convert to two family. She added further that she needed the additional income.

Mr. Reynolds asked if her neighbor were to the north or south and Mrs. Brennan stated she lives at 2805.

Mr. Fink asked the number of rooms in the house and whether or not it is one story. Mrs. Brennan stated she would use three rooms downstairs for herself.

Mrs. Bonita Wenzel, of 2805 N. East Street stated she was the one who had no objections.

Mrs. Bretz asked if she would object to having her property also rezoned at the same time and Mrs. Wenzel stated she would have no objections.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-133-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 5843 and 5831 S. Logan Street from "A" one family residential to "F" commercial district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-135-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 700 Blk. of E. Saginaw Street described as:

Commencing on North line of East Saginaw St. 350 feet East of East line of Marshall Street, thence North parallel to Marshall Street to a point 450 feet South of South line of East Grand River Avenue, thence East parallel to East Grand River Avenue to a point 99.6 feet West of East line of Section 10, thence South parallel to East line of Section 10 to North line of East Saginaw Street, thence West to point of beginning, Section 10, T4N, R2W,

from "B" one family to "D-1" professional offices district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-136-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 6900 and 6928 S. Cedar Street from "A" residential to "F" commercial.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

BUSINESS SESSION

Z-118-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus that the Planning Board hold a public hearing on the Community Unit Plan submitted by Creative Builders, Inc. of Urbana, Illinois for property located in the 600 Block of Northrup, on Tuesday, August 16, 1966, at 7:30 P.M.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-134-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus that the setting of the Public Hearing for the Community Unit Plan submitted by Harold M. Davis for property at 122 W. Miller Road be tabled pending a letter of withdrawal from the petitioner.

Mrs. Bretz gave an explanation of the Zoning Process.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-96-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Mitchel M. Skory to rezone a parcel at 905 Cleveland amended to include 901 Cleveland from "B-1" residential to "F" commercial district be denied.

1. A legal non-conforming use should not be encouraged to expand. On the contrary, the community should attempt by whatever legal methods are available to neutralize or eliminate it.
2. Commercial Zoning at this location is entirely out of character with the existing residential developments.
3. On March 8, 1966 the Planning Board recommended that the State Highway Department pursue the widening of Oakland Ave. between Grand River Ave. and Ballard St. on the North side. The subject property would be directly involved if this plan is carried out.
4. The applicants express purpose of providing additional off street parking would result in further intrusion of a commercial use into the now stable residential street.
5. The present use is not neighborhood oriented and therefore is not dependent upon this particular location for success.
6. The overcrowding which prompted this zoning request is an indirect result of past abuses of good land use practice, i.e. the corner lot originally platted for a single family dwelling, (62.3 by 132 ft.) has subsequently been split into three sub-standard lots containing two dwellings and a combination store and dwelling. Further abuse of land development would not be in the best interest of the city.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-97-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino that the petition by Erwin Dale Mulder to

rezone a parcel at 2923 N. East Street and vacant north and adjacent to said first property described as:

The North 42 ft. of Lot 2. Supervisor's Plat of Community Home Sites, Lansing Township, Ingham County, Michigan, All that part of Lot 3 of Supervisor's Plat of Community Home Sites of a part of the S.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the N.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 4, T4N, R2W, Lansing Township, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one family to "F" commercial district be tabled to August 16th.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-103-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino that the petition by Clark R. Ackley, Architect for St. Michael's Episcopal Church to rezone a parcel at 2709 Eifert Road from "A" one family to "B" one family be tabled for thirty days.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-106-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by W. Prentice Peck for the Michigan Conference of the Evangelical United Brethren Church to rezone a parcel at 5438 S. Pennsylvania Ave. described as:

Com. on the W. line of the E. 100 acres of the N.W. fractional $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 3, T3N, R2W, Delhi Twp., Ingham County, Michigan, at a point 790.25 ft. E. and 530 ft. N. of the W. $\frac{1}{4}$ post of said Section 3, thence E. 466.22 ft. to the W. line of Pennsylvania Ave., thence N. 130 ft. along the W. line of Pennsylvania Ave., thence W. 466.64 ft. more or less, parallel with the E. and W. $\frac{1}{4}$ line to the W. line of the E. 100 acres of the N.W. fractional $\frac{1}{4}$, thence S. 130 ft. to the point of beginning

from "A" one family to "D-1" professional be denied, and that the

East 260 feet of the North 65 feet of the property, (except the east 50 feet thereof)

be rezoned from "A" one family to "D-1" professional and the

East 50 feet

be rezoned from "A" one family to "J" parking district.

The petitioner has no immediate development plans. To zone the entire site without such plans could prevent orderly development of the vacant land to the west of the site.

Mr. Reynolds asked if this would give the petitioner room to do what he wants, and was informed that it did.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-108-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Jay H. Raines to rezone a parcel at 5723 S. Waverly Road from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied and the petitioner be encouraged to plat in conjunction with development to the south and east as shown on the sketch.

1. The Master Plan indicates this area as low density residential.
2. The Board believes that replating in conjunction with the proposed plat to the south and east should precede any rezoning or further development, in order to insure utilization of the land in scale and harmony with overall development.
3. The density allowed in the "D-M" multiple family district is completely out of character with the existing and proposed development of the area.

Mr. Fink asked if the staff proposed street extension be developed as such, is the petitioner aware of this proposal, and was informed that he was not informed. Mr. Fink then stated that he feels it is the Board's obligation to notify the petitioner.

Mr. Black stated that he felt this was already in the recommendation.

The Secretary called the Board's attention to the fact that there was an error in the drawing and the single family homes will not interfere with the proposed streets.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-110-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by William K. Byrd to rezone property at 324 S. Butler Blvd. from "C" two family to "F" commercial district be granted, and further recommends that no commercial zoning be allowed north of this parcel due to desirability of concentrating commercial south of this

point and the undesirability of intense use of land in the ROW of future streets.

1. The Central City Development Plan projects this area for the neighborhood service type facilities.

Mr. Fink asked if the proposed realignment of Butler would be cutting off one-third of this property?

Mr. Brown stated that the circumstances surrounding his request justify this and the realignment is possibly seven to ten years away.

Some discussion was held on the zoning to "F" and the amount of the property that should be considered for the commercial classification.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Manz that the front half of the lot be zoned "F" commercial and the balance be zoned "J" parking.

Mr. Black stated that if the rear part is developed for parking, the state, when they buy will have to pay as much as if it were all zoned for commercial.

Mr. Manz stated that this lot and one immediately south possibly should be included. These houses are in the squeeze at the same time.

Some discussion was held on the possibility of making another amendment to include this.

There was no motion for the second amendment.

The Secretary advised the Board that it would be necessary to notify the property owners and set a hearing date if the second amendment were to be acted upon.

Motion on the original recommendation carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Manz and Siebert—6.

Nays: Fink and Reynolds—2.

Z-113-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Harold W. Knight to rezone a parcel at 7011 S. Cedar St. from "A" one family to "H" light industrial district be denied.

1. This is a spot type of zone unrelated to adjacent development and land potential.
2. The Land Use Plan of Lansing opposes the excess of strip commercial occurring along major thoroughfares. Strip development at this location would prevent good development on adjacent land.

3. The boundaries, I-496, South Cedar and Consumers Power ROW indicates that this site should be a prime location for medium density residential. The free-way and power company right-of-way provide permanent open space, and a confining boundary. The major thoroughfare, programmed to become a local street, would give residents easy access to all portions of the community.
4. There is enough land in this pocket to allow good multiple development, and not enough land to encourage single family development.
5. This is a major entry to the city which would indicate that only good integrated land development should be permitted to occur.

Mr. Manz asked the zoning required for the adjoining power substation and the Secretary advised that they receive a special use permit from the Board of Zoning Appeals, and if the permit is granted, they can be placed in any zoning classification.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-114-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Fink that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Mr. and Mrs. Harold Farmer to rezone a parcel at 117 E. Elm Street from "D-M" multiple dwelling to "J" parking district be granted and the east and north property lines except for the residential set-backs on Elm St. shall be screened. Screening shall consist of either:

- A. A three foot high chain link fence with dense evergreen plantings of mature height of four to five feet;
- B. A four foot high decorative masonry wall;
- C. A four foot high privet or similar deciduous hedge; or
- D. Any other screening as may be approved by the Planning Board.

if used during the hours of darkness the lot shall be illuminated to an intensity of 2/10 lumens per square foot. Lighting shall be so arranged to prevent glare to abutting property.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-115-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Mrs. Evelyn White to rezone a parcel at 1400 Grand River Ave., 900 Blk. Maryland from "C" two family residence to "D-M" multiple dwelling be denied.

1. Recent rezoning records show that three requests for multiple zoning in this area have been denied.
2. The square footage of the two lots would not be sufficient to permit more than two dwelling units, if developed according to standards recommended to Council.
3. Multiple dwellings are not consistent with the character of the area.
4. Two family zoning allows reasonable use of the land.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Abstain: Fink—1.

Z-116-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by W. Richard Neller acting for Industrial Projects, Inc. to rezone property in the Lantex Subdivision with addresses of: 3300 Remy Dr., 2100-2200 Apollo, 3300 Ranger Road and 2100 Mint Road described as:

Lots No. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21 of Lantex Industrial Park,

from "G-2" wholesale to "H" light industrial district be granted.

The Board further recommends that:

Lots 2 and 22 of Lantex Subdivision

be rezoned from "G-2" wholesale to "H" light industrial district.

1. Site is ideal for light industry in that it is served by rail. A major thoroughfare and has easy access to the regional airport.
2. Lots are sized and located to accommodate this type of activity.
3. The Master Land Use Plan indicates this land as industrial.
4. This parcel is so situated that it will not have an adverse effect on residential districts.

5. This district is appropriately located as regards accessibility for workers from residential areas.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-117-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Andrew J., Louis E. and Bobby D. Husband to rezone property in the 716 and 800 W. St. Joseph St. described as:

Lot 18 and E. 6 feet of Lot 17 of Block 6 of Bush, Butler and Sparrow's Addition to Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan and W. 60 feet of Lot 17, Block 6 of Bush, Butler and Sparrow's Addition, City of Lansing

from "C" two family to "F" commercial district be denied.

1. The Master Land Use Plan does not show a commercial use at this location.
2. The Central City Plan shows this area proposed for two story townhouse development.
3. Recent requests for rezoning of properties east of Butler on the north side of West St. Joseph St. for commercial use have been denied, or discouraged by the Planning Board and City Council.
4. The granting of this zoning would create a spot-zone detrimental to the existing residential development.
5. St. Joseph St. is a one-way west, any vehicular traffic wishing to gain access to the proposed commercial site would have to follow through a residential area.
6. There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be developed in accord with the existing zoning.
7. The concentration of commercial development for this area has been suggested for the block bounded by Logan St., Hillsdale St., Butler Blvd. and St. Joseph St. The Board has met with the petitioners previously and encouraged them to develop in this area.

Mr. Fink asked about the zoning classification for town houses, and he was advised that it would remain as is until the new zoning ordinance is put in effect.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-119-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by B. Gale Hetrick, Executive Secretary for General Assembly Church of God in Michigan to rezone a parcel at 1000 Blk. Cavanaugh at Alpha from "D-M" multiple dwelling to "D-1" professional district be granted.

The Board does not believe the proposed use will have any adverse affect on the surrounding land use.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-120-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Fink that the petition by Byron T. and M. Jean Bradley to rezone a parcel at 2721 N. Grand River Avenue from "D-M" multiple dwelling and "A" one family to "F" commercial district, be tabled to August 16th for a ruling from the City Attorney on special use permission on this property.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-121-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Eva Bailey Real Estate applying for Owner, William Davis to rezone property at 207 W. Grand River Ave. from "C" two family to "F" commercial district be denied.

The change would be contrary to the proposed land use pattern which is medium density residential.

The change would allow uses that would adversely affect living conditions in the immediate area principally through the increase of traffic and activity.

The change may adversely affect property values in the vicinity and may, therefore, deter the improvement of adjacent properties.

This could lead to strip commercial development along this area of Grand River Ave.

There are no systematic reasons why the property cannot continue to be used under the existing zoning.

It appears from the comments made on the application that this request is merely speculation and there is no proposed use of the property.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-122-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Manz that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by W. F. Nuechterlein for Our Savior Lutheran Church and School to rezone property at 1601 W. Holmes Road described as:

Lot 37 Supervisor's Plat of Hillcrest Farms, according to the recorded plat thereof, being part of the S. $\frac{1}{2}$ of the N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ and the N.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 32, T4N, R2W, Lansing Township, Ingham County, Michigan. Also the E. 16 acres of the N.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 32, T4N, R2W, Lansing Twp., Ingham County, EXCEPTING therefrom a parcel described as commencing at the N. $\frac{1}{4}$ post of said Section 32, thence W. along the N. section line 196 feet thence S. 233 feet thence E. 196 to the N. and S. $\frac{1}{4}$ line of Section 32, thence N. along the N. and S. $\frac{1}{4}$ line 233 feet to the point of begin; together with a non-exclusive right-of-way over and across the W. 66 feet of the parcel above excepted, to be used in common with the owners and/or occupants of the lands adjoining said ROW on the E.

from "A" one family to "B" one family district be denied as filed except that portion of the property lying south of the north line of Warwick Dr. extended west to the west line of the subject property described as:

Lot 37, Supervisor's Plat of Hillcrest Farms and the South 361.30 ft. of the East 16 acres of the N.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 32, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

remain in present zoning classification

And the balance of the property

be rezoned "A" one family to "B" one family district.

1. The owners are limited to the types of improvements and expansion of the existing church and school on the site.
2. The existing and proposed use provides a proper transition between the encroachment of commercial from the east, and the potential residential area to the west of the site.
3. The site has direct access to a primary thoroughfare.
4. Development of the entire site without the extension of public streets and utilities would isolate the potential resi-

dential development east of Warwick Drive and eliminate proper traffic flow through the area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-123-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Charles F. Blair to rezone a parcel at 3839 Moores River Drive from "A-1" family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied. The Board further believes that one lot on the westerly end of this property could be considered for "C" two family after the property is properly sub-divided, either by a minor subdivision or regular platting procedures.

1. The granting of the "D-M" multiple request would allow a high density development at the critical intersection of Moores River Drive and Waverly Road, creating additional traffic conflict at this point.
2. Platting of the property, compatible with the area along Cooley Drive should precede any zoning or development of the property.

Mr. Manz mentioned that a petitioner not long ago to the south of this was turned down at the end of Inverary.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-124-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino that the Board Recommend to City Council that the petition by Cecil W. Farris to rezone a parcel in the 5700 Block of Orchard Court described as:

Commencing at a point 1141.4 ft. N. and 222.75 ft. E. of the S.W. corner of Section 3, T3N, R2W, Delhi Township, Ingham County, Michigan, thence N. 822.1 ft., thence E. 222.75 ft., thence S. 822.1 ft., thence W. 222.75 ft. to place of beginning

from "A" one family residential to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied and the property be zoned "C" two family subject to a plat being filed.

1. "C" two family on this property would provide a proper transition between the proposed land use to the east and the single family to the west.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-125-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Donald A. Hines, Attorney for General Motors Corporation to rezone parcels in Block 178 and 181, Original Plat; Block 1 of Morrison's Subdivision of Block 16 in Townsend's Plat and Assessors Plat No. 3 on Blocks 1, 2 and 15 of Townsend's Subdivision; all located in the City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan from "C" two family, "D-1" professional offices district, "F" commercial and "J" parking to "I" heavy industrial district be denied as filed and the Board recommends that:

All of Lots 4 and 5 and the West $\frac{1}{4}$ of Lot 3, Block 178, Original Plat, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan except the North 30 ft. thereof

be rezoned from "C" two family to "I" heavy industrial and

The North 30 feet

be rezoned from "C" two family to "J" parking district, and that parcel of land described as:

The West 123.75 feet of Lots 13 and 14 and the North 8 feet of the West 123.75 feet of Lot 12, in Sparrow's Subdivision on Block 178, Original Plat, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan (General Location: The 800 Block of South Walnut Street)

be rezoned from "C" two family to "I" heavy industrial district.

The South $45\frac{1}{2}$ feet of Lot 1 and the South $45\frac{1}{2}$ feet of the East $\frac{1}{4}$ of Lot 2, and the West $\frac{1}{4}$ of Lot 4, and all of Lot 5, Block 181, Original Plat, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, except the North 30 ft. Lot 5 and the North 30 ft. of West $\frac{1}{4}$ of Lot 4

be rezoned from "C" two family to "I" heavy industrial

said North 30 feet

being rezoned from "C" two family to "J" parking district. General location: The Southeast corner of West Main Street and South Sycamore Street, and 812 South Pine Street.

All of Block 1, of Morrison's Subdivision of Block 16 in Townsend's Plat of the North $\frac{1}{2}$ of Section 20, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, (EXCEPTING THEREFROM, First, Lots 14, 15 and 16, Block 1, said Mor-

risson's Subdivision, and Second, the South $\frac{1}{2}$ of Lot 17 and the South $\frac{1}{2}$ of Lot 18, Block 1, said Morrison's Subdivision) City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, except the North 30 Ft. thereof

be rezoned from "C" two family to "I" heavy industrial, and

The North 30 ft.

be rezoned from "C" two family to "J" parking district. General location: The 800 Block of West Main Street.

All of Lot 106, and the East 125 feet of Lot 107, and all of Lots 108 to 117, inclusive, and all of Lot 121 all in Assessor's Plat No. 3, on Blocks 1, 2 and 15 of Townsend's Subdivision on Section 20, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan (General location: 900 Block of South Butler Boulevard)

be rezoned from "C" two family to "I" heavy industrial.

All of Lots 1 and 2, and the East $\frac{3}{4}$ of Lot 3, Block 178, Original Plat, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan: and that parcel of land described as: Commencing at the Northeast corner of Sparrow's Subdivision on Block 178, Original Plat, City of Lansing, and thence West $206\frac{1}{4}$ feet, thence South 78 feet, thence East $206\frac{1}{4}$ feet, thence North 78 feet to place of beginning, in the City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan except the North 30 ft. thereof

be rezoned from "D-1" professional offices to "I" heavy industrial district and

The North 30 feet

be rezoned from "D-1" professional offices district to "J" parking district. General location: the 800 Block of Townsend St.

The North 103.0 feet of Lot 1 and the North 103.0 feet of the East $\frac{1}{4}$ of Lot 2, Block 181, Original Plat, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, except the North 30 ft. thereof

be rezoned from "J" parking to "I" heavy industrial district and

The North 30 ft.

to remain in "J" parking district. General Location: S.W. corner W. Main and S. Pine St.

All of Lots 4, 15 and 16, Block 1 of Morrison's Subdivision of Block 16 in Townsend's Plat of the North $\frac{1}{2}$ of Section 20, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan except the North 30 ft. thereof

be rezoned from "J" parking to "I" heavy industrial district,

The North 30 feet

to remain in "J" parking district. General Location: 800 Block William St.

Lots 122 through 128, inclusive, in Assessor's Plat No. 3, on Blocks 1, 2 and 15 of Townsend's Subdivision on Section 20, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan (General location: The Northeast corner of S. Logan St. and Olds Avenue.,

be rezoned from "F" commercial to "I" heavy industrial district.

The Planning Board further recommends that:

The West $\frac{3}{4}$ of Lot 2, all of Lot 3 and the East $\frac{3}{4}$ of Lot 4, except the North 30 ft. thereof all in Block 181 Original Plat, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

be rezoned from "C" two family to "I" heavy industrial and

The North 30 ft.,

be rezoned from "C" two family to "J" parking district

The South $\frac{1}{2}$ of Lots 17 and 18, Block 1, Morrison's Subdivision, City of Lansing,

be rezoned from "C" two family to "I" heavy industrial district and

All of Lots 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, the West 40 ft. of Lot 107, entire Lots 118, 119, 120 all in Assessor's Plat No. 3 on Blocks 1, 2 and 15 of Townsend's Subdivision on Section 20, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

be rezoned from "C" two family to "I" heavy industrial district.

Any changes of zoning should be based on a comprehensive zoning and proposed development plan.

A special survey was made to find the location best suited to accommodate the future industrial demands of the community. The following characteristics were considered in analyzing potential sites:

- a. Transportation — accessibility by rail, highway and air facilities.
- b. Topography — leveiness, freedom from flooding and adverse said conditions.
- c. Utilities and services — ease and economy of serving with utilities and services.
- d. Effect on surrounding property-absence of nuisance aspect or prospect of otherwise damaging adjacent property.
- e. Location of overall plan — suitability with respect to relative need for land for other uses.
- f. Accessibility to workers — appropriately located as to be readily accessible to workers from residential areas.
- g. Size of site-large enough to provide sufficient acreage for modern facilities and space for future expansion.

This area falls within the proposed industrial complex as indicated on the Master Land Use Plan.

Mr. Manz asked if there were any objections on the part of the petitioners?

Mr. Fink stated that it was consistent with other zoning in this area.

Mr. Fountain advised that their attorney objected to the thirty feet of open green space that was recommended on a previous rezoning. Council did not require the open space on the final approval.

The Secretary reported that the Parks and Recreation Department, the Planning Staff and Oldsmobile have been working on plant boxes to be placed in the city's right-of-way. This will provide screening along the Main Street side. Final plans for the plant boxes will come before the Board.

Some discussion was held on the ugliness of the present view in this area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-126-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Eva Bailey Real Estate applying for owner, William Davis to rezone property at 1216 and 1222 West Wash-tenaw from "B-1" residential to "F" commercial district be denied.

1. The proposed change would create a spot-zone within a residential area.
2. The proposed change would have a detrimental affect on the surrounding property. Principally through the increase of traffic and activity.
3. Commercial areas should be physically separated from residential areas, but should be convenient to them and accessible from major thoroughfares.
4. The one-way street system in this area makes access to this site difficult.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

STREETS COMMITTEE

SS-16-64 Pleasant Grove Extension

The Board were informed that the Board of Water and Light feel that this plan is not satisfactory as it might interfere with their water plant expansion and therefore it is recommended that this matter be tabled for further consideration.

Mr. Black stated that he personally preferred the Piper Avenue route. He said he felt the Piper-Logan angle could be arranged making this an alternate.

BUILDINGS AND PROPERTIES

The Secretary advised that the Mayor's office had referred the matter of the Pleasant Grove park and other park possibilities in this area. The Staff will bring their recommendations before the committee for review on August 16, 1966.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Ronald R. Gierthy, Planner V was introduced to the Board and a short synopsis of his education, and experience was related.

The Board was reminded that the week of August 15th, Mr. Edwin P. Brown would be attending the conference in Portland, Oregon.

It was called to the Board's attention that City Council had approved the remodeling of the 5th floor at their last meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

Z-75-66

The City Council had referred this petition to rezone the property in the 900 Block of Miller Road from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district, back to the Planning Board at the request of the attorney representing the petitioner.

The Zoning Committee requested that Mr. Leo A. Farhat, Attorney, present to the Staff a written report of his reason for requesting that the Planning Board again review this petition. Mr. Farhat is to be allowed as much time to meet with the staff as he desires, and then the Staff are to forward a new recommendation to the Zoning Committee for the October meeting.

The Secretary asked the Board if they had any additions or corrections for the Achievement Report.

Motion by Manz, seconded by Siebert that the Achievement Report be adopted.

Meeting adjourned at 9:55 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF BOARD OF PUBLIC SERVICE OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, September 7, 1966

Metieng called to order by Chairman Tietz at 7:30 p.m.

Present: Mrs. Borgman, Messrs. Fagion, Guysselman, Hack, Mosher, Russell, Tietz, and Zapata—8.

Absent: None.

Minutes of the previous meeting approved as read.

Referral from City Council of Planning Board recommendation to name a street after Herbert McCourt.

Referred to Streets and Sidewalk Committee.

Referral from City Council of a letter from Mr. and Mrs. Robert L. Limon relative to waiver of sewer fee.

Referred to Waste Disposal Committee.

Letter from Director of Parks and Recreation relative to closing of Dakin Street Bridge to vehicular traffic.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, August 16, 1966

Meeting was called to order at 7:40 P.M.
by Chairman Ramona J. Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino,
Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Absent: Black and Heino—2.

The Chairman presented an outline of
the meeting.

HEARINGS

Z-118-66

The Secretary discussed the principles
of the Community Unit Plan.

Mr. Alan E. Tubbs, of the staff pre-
sented the master plan proposals and the
existing development. Approximately 155
people were in the audience.

Mr. Gordon Morrow, representing Roy
D. Murphy and Associates, for Creative
Builders and Associates gave the back-
ground of their firm. They develop multiple
family homes in growing cities. They plan
to develop only the south ten acres.
This site will increase the traffic and the
number of school children in the area,
however, this would happen even if de-
veloped other than under the Community
Unit. It is proposed to use Washington
and I-27 as ingress and egress points. The
site is centrally located between five differ-
ent schools so the increase of enrollment
could be easily taken up by these schools.
They believe this is an excellent location
as far as being near shopping centers. The
165 ft. Consumers Power Company right-
of-way is being proposed as a nature trail
and school path. It is proposed to use the
north four acres for park and play area
for the whole area. This would be adjacent
to the elementary school if developed. There
will not be traffic going through other sub-
divisions. The 90 to 95 structures would be
of town house design. Development costs
are estimated to be about two million dol-
lars, it will run about \$20,000 per dwelling
unit. This includes all utilities. They feel
it will be an aesthetic and appealing to the
neighborhood. Plans call for 34 two bed-
room, 34 three bedroom and 24 four bed-
room units. Some of the surrounding area

may develop for industrial and this is fair-
ly close to existing plants. This plan meets
all the qualifications of the seven criteria
for Community Unit Plans. A drawing
was presented showing the proposed type
of units. They will be in row houses, each
family will have one unit—both the up-
stairs and the downstairs. They proposed
to have the rows staggered forward and
back for a more residential appearance.
The exterior of the residences will vary in
color and roof style to make them more
individual. The proposed street will go up,
around and back to Northrup with private
drives. There will be lot-lots in the center
of these squares. There are proposed walks
to the park. The drives will be on peri-
meter to keep the children off the streets.

Mr. Gaus asked the proposed rental and
Mr. Morrow advised that the type of financ-
ing they get will be the guide to determine
the rates. Others they have constructed
have rented for \$125.00 to \$175.00. None
rent for under \$125.00 per month.

Mr. Gaus then asked "is this to be con-
sidered a low cost housing?" Mr. Morrow
stated that it would depend on the mortgage
financing.

Recess from 8:10 to 8:18. The questions
were then solicited from the audience.

The following persons presented ques-
tions:

Mr. Charles J. Ward, 304 E. Northrup St.

Mr. Edward M. Breier, 401 Redner St.

Mr. Don Holtrop, Michigan Civil Rights
Commission

Mr. Martin H. Karkau, 301 E. Northrup St.

Mr. Bryce Bryde, 5711 Schafer Road

Mr. Rudolph S. Soderberg, 500 Doris St.

Mr. Floyd Decker, 201 E. Northrup St.

Rev. Kenneth L. Faiver, Cristo Rey Com-
munity Center, 1306 Ballard

Mr. Manker R. Harris, 1223 E. Cavanaugh
Road

Mr. Ralph W. Taylor, 617 Northrup

Mr. Paul Olson, 314 Redner
 Mr. Richard Andrews, 5705 Schafer Road
 Mr. Carl A. Hager, 307 Redner Street
 Mr. Kenneth R. McNutt, 5625 Schafer Rd.
 Mr. Michael L. Fickies
 Mr. Ned Forster, 836 W. Northrup
 Mr. Ray W. Marshall, 5635 S. Washington
 Mr. Albert J. Teller, 5722 Schafer
 Mr. Arnold Feguer, 700 Northrup
 Mrs. Doris Eckman, 715 W. Northrup
 Mr. Patrick Bickert, 501 Doris St.
 Mr. Harold Hurni, 627 Northrup Street
 Mr. Ronald D. Schramm, 712 West Northrup
 Mr. Ted Boettcher
 Mr. Stacer, Housing Chairman - Lansing Area of Churches
 Mr. William Pittman, 125 E. Northrup

Some of the questions asked by these citizens were:

Concerning the construction of the town houses, and whether the Federal Government would pay part of the rent. If the parks and play areas would be completed at the same time the houses were completed. The approximate life of these buildings.

What was being done for housing in Lansing and felt more interest should be shown by the citizens of Lansing concerning this project.

Wanted to know about the 66 ft. ROW, and if some of the existing property would be reduced. Whether Federal Government was backing the project with funds. Taxes and the financing of the project. Some wanted to know if this would lower the values of their homes. Others were interested to know if this project was going to be a Turn-key program.

Another question of concern involved the need for sewers and drains. Traffic was discussed, some believed it would create problems. After much discussion the matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-188-65

Mr. W. Richard Neller appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 6326 S. Cedar Street from "A" one family to a Community Unit Plan and presented revised plans for the Kahres Farm. Mr. Neller advised that he would like the Board to consider this plan in two sections. North of Edgewood there are 19½ acres proposed for school, park site and playground. Opposite the school is a church site of about 4½ to 5 acres. The remaining area is to be single family lots.

Edgewood will remain in a boulevard with 120 ft. right-of-way. There will be no drives on the Boulevard.

South of Edgewood is proposed the regional shopping center surrounding the grove of trees, and including a covered mall. An access road to the west is for multiple housing. This was at the request of the Board of Education who do not want single family homes south of the boulevard.

Mr. Neller added that this is almost identical with the second proposal. The statistics in gross figures, 43 acres of 2 family, 48 acres of multiple family. The 4200 ft. long boulevard, 11 acres; another 9 acres for median so that it would be very easy to compile the other 20 acres, making a total of 40 acres for street purposes. 68 acres are proposed for the shopping center with 17 acres for office, motel and buffer strips for a total of 85 acres.

Mr. Siebert asked if the church site had been definitely established and Mr. Neller advised that he had not officially met with the church yet.

Mr. George Giddings of the Board of Education stated that he had no objections to the development, however, it does show two busy streets adjacent to the proposed school site. He further expressed their concern for children crossing a divided highway, however, a buffer zone could make it acceptable to them.

Mr. Fink asked for a clarification, was the main concern to have the school North of Edgewood? Mr. Giddings replied that their main concern now was the two busy streets, however, there will be less children from a multiple housing area.

Mr. Neller remarked that Edgewood will be a major street. There may be considerable traffic on Gardenia and suggested that the sidewalks be turned toward the schools.

Mr. Giddings said he wondered if turns or other features might be used to encourage a reduced speed.

Mr. Nicholas Fields, of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, offered that they are not in any position to discuss the matter. They want to go over the offer with Mr. Neller.

Mr. Clark Ackley, Architect, for St. Michael's Church asked if, on the shopping center mentioned, a portion was developed and then stopped, what use would the remaining area be put to? He assumed this would be vacant land.

Mr. Neller explained that a portion of the shopping center would be developed now, and the balance of the development would depend on what the market would need at that time.

Mr. Ackley felt this might have further bearing on the church building location.

Some discussion followed on: whether the new location would have any advantage

over the present site, and on whether the Board would act on the Zoning petition by St. Michael's Church, inasmuch as their main concern was time.

Mr. Neller stated he believed the roads could be put in to the proposed site. Sewer is being installed now.

Mr. Gaus asked if St. Michaels had a commitment to build now, and was advised that they do. They have some funds. St. Paul's own the property. Mr. Gaus then asked the type of building plans if this were to be a transition building. Mr. Ackley advised that an addition is all that they propose to do now.

Mr. Fink asked clarification on the shopping center. The eastern portion will be an addition to the existing, with the northern portion being developed first.

Mr. Fink asked the size of the shopping area, and Mr. Neller stated that they want an opportunity to compete with other proposals. He mentioned regional shopping centers he had visited recently. He further added that he believes there are enough stores interested in the regional shopping center. They are asking for 68 acres for development.

Mr. Gaus questioned that the agenda stated that the rezoning was from "A" one to a Community Unit Plan and this seemed to cover many areas. Mr. Neller explained that the presentation is the Master Plan, and each development in the future would come in as a Community Unit Plan for Board consideration.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

BUSINESS SESSION

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Siebert that the minutes of July 19, 1966 be approved.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

S-2-65P Prawdzik Subd.

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Siebert that a public hearing be held on this preliminary plat on Tuesday, September 6, 1966 at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1, 6th Floor of City Hall.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-34-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Manz that the Board recommend to City Council that the request for withdrawal of the petition by Keith B. Granger to rezone a parcel at 6100 S. Cedar St. described as:

That part of the N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 4, T3N, R2W, City of Lansing, described as; Beginning on the south line of Jolly Road 764 feet east and 33 feet south of the N. $\frac{1}{4}$ corner of Section 3, T3N, R2W, thence south 620 feet parallel to the N.S. $\frac{1}{4}$ line of Section 3, thence east 110 feet parallel to the north line of Section 3; thence north 350 feet parallel to the N.S. $\frac{1}{4}$ line; thence west 80 feet parallel to the north section line; thence north 270 feet parallel to the N.S. $\frac{1}{4}$ line to the south line of Jolly Road; thence west 30 feet to the point of beginning, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one family to Community Unit Plan district be accepted and that the property remain in its present classification.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-97-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus that the petition by Erwin Dale Mulder to rezone a parcel at 2923 North East Street and vacant north and adjacent described as:

The North 42 ft. of Lot 2 Supervisor's Plat of Community Homes Site, Lansing Township, Ingham County, Michigan. All that part of Lot 3, of Supervisor's Plat of Community Home Sites of a part of the S.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the N.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 4, T4N, R2W, Lansing Township, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one family to "F" commercial district be tabled to September 6th, pending a letter of withdrawal from the petitioner.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-120-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus that the petition by Byron T. and M. Jean Bradley to rezone a parcel at 2721 N. Grand River Avenue from "D-M" multiple and "A" one family to "F" commercial district be tabled until September 6th, for an opinion from the City Attorney on a Special Use Permit.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

STREETS COMMITTEE

SS-4-66

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz that the Ottawa Street Extension study be tabled until the September 20th meeting.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

S-1-66

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds that the meeting of the Planning Board

on August 16, 1966 the Preliminary Plat of Decker Subdivision

"except that portion lying west of the east line of Lot 9 of Rand-Kris Subdivision extended"

be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Final Plat to be developed with public improvements as required by the Michigan State Plat Act and Lansing Subdivision Regulations.
2. Construction and improvement drawings should be submitted and approved prior to approval of final plat.
3. All required easements should be recorded on the face of the final plat.
4. All lots should be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.
5. Street ROW should be 66 feet with a 36 foot pavement.
6. A temporary cul-de-sac should be constructed at the west end of Redner Street extended.
7. This approval shall expire August 16, 1967.

Mr. Fink asked why the exception? He was advised that there are no utilities to serve this area. The topography is too low and would require a pumping station.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

S-11-66

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds that the Preliminary Plat of Keegan Property be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Final Plat to be developed with public improvements as required by the Michigan State Plat Act and Lansing Subdivision Regulations.
2. Construction and improvement drawings should be submitted and approved prior to approval of final plat.
3. All required easements should be recorded on the face of the final plat.
4. All lots should be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.
5. Street ROW should be 66 feet with a 36 foot pavement. A right-of-way dedication of 60 ft. east of the west line of Section 7 for Waverly Road should be provided.

6. Outlots of F and G of Ravenswood Subd. should be acquired by the developers and included in the final plat as street ROW to provide access on Briarwood Drive and Springbrook Lane.

7. Lot 14 should be adjusted to lie entirely within the City of Lansing or Lansing Township.

8. A plat restriction prohibiting access along Waverly Road should appear on the face of the plat.

9. The final plat should include both that portion within the City of Lansing and that portion within Lansing Township.

10. This approval shall expire August 16, 1967.

Mr. Siebert recommended that the developer be commended for the fine plan.

Mr. Fink remarked that it seems the lots to the north seem to need fill. Mr. Tabbs then stated that some of the lots will be filled but the flood plain will be retained as such.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

S-5-66

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds that the Final Plat of Holiday Plaza be approved and recommends that it be approved by City Council subject to the following conditions:

1. All public improvements shall be installed with complete public utilities including water, sanitary sewers, storm sewers, and full street improvements including street paving, curb and gutter, sidewalks and such other improvements as required under Section VI D of Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

2. The posting of financial security in the amount of:

| | |
|--------------------------------|-------------|
| Monument Deposit | \$ 500.00 |
| Street grade and gravel | 2,800.00 |
| Storm and Sanitary Sewer | 14,500.00 |
| Total | \$17,800.00 |

prior to the signing and affixing of the municipal seal.

3. All other standards and requirements of the Michigan State Plat Act, Act 172, Public Acts of 1929 as amended shall apply.

4. No ingress or egress shall be allowed along the portion of the proposed Fier-

pont St. which is 66 feet wide. If an additional 14 foot of ROW be dedicated, then access may be provided.

A letter has been received from the owner of the adjacent land indicating his willingness to negotiate with the developer for additional right-of-way for Pierpont St.

Mr. Manz asked why item four about ingress and egress was a condition, and was informed that this would allow no curb cuts on the sixty-six foot right-of-way on either side.

Mr. Fink stated he was in support of the recommendation on this as this may be a safety factor. If the curb cuts were allowed they might pose a serious problem.

Mr. Manz stated that Logan St. is only 66 ft. wide.

Mr. Siebert then asked about the north-south street width and was informed that it is 80 ft. wide.

Some discussion was held on the proposed use for some of this area. A letter, from Mr. Ducharme, relative to a proposal for land adjacent to the 66 foot roadway was received.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

S-9-66

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds that the Preliminary Plat of Coachlight Estates be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Final Plat to be developed with public improvements as required by the Michigan State Plat Act and Lansing Subdivision Regulations.
2. Construction and improvement drawings should be submitted and approved prior to approval of the final plat.
3. All required easements should be recorded on the face of the final plat.
4. Street ROW should be 66 ft. with a 36 foot pavement. A right-of-way dedication of 60 ft. north of the south and east of the west lines of Section 6 for Miller and Waverly Roads should be provided.
5. A plat restriction prohibiting access from residential lots to Waverly Road should appear on the face of the final plat.
6. All lots should be graded so that storm water shall drain therefrom.

7. This approval shall expire August 16, 1967.

Mr. Fink asked about the school site and was advised that borings are being drilled. The Parks and Recreation Board is working cooperatively with the Board of Education.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

BUILDINGS AND PROPERTIES

Pleasant Grove Park. This matter is still in committee and may be ready for discussion at the next board meeting.

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. Reynolds submitted the following report:

URBAN RENEWAL PROGRESS REPORT

August 16, 1966

LLOYD REYNOLDS LAND ACQUISITION AND CONDEMNATION.

Out of a total of 110 parcels of land to be acquired in the Urban Renewal Project, approximately 30 parcels still remain to be acquired are under condemnation. Some preliminary hearings have been held in the Circuit Court of Judge Salmon during the past several months and the first jury hearings are scheduled for October. Meanwhile, efforts are continuing toward acquiring property prior to trial.

REDEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL OF LANSING AREA REDEVELOPMENT CORPORATION.

The Lansing City Council held a public hearing on the sale of the 100 block of Washington Avenue to the Lansing Area Redevelopment Corporation for construction of a complex including a department store, motor hotel, and office building. This public hearing as required by law will now permit the City Council to authorize the Mayor and City Clerk to sign the contract for development with this corporation. Five parcels still remain unacquired in this block but the redeveloper is still working on the redeveloping plans while the condemnation court actions are in process.

REDEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS IN 300 BLOCK OF N. WASHINGTON AVENUE.

During the past month the advertising for redevelopment proposals in the two blocks bounded by Shiawassee, Grand, Ionia and Capitol begin. Proposed uses for this area include development of offices and retail uses primarily oriented to the Community College development. Proposals for this area are scheduled to be received by November 7, 1966.

COORDINATION OF REDEVELOPMENT.

To coordinate development in the Project area the City of Lansing has recently hired the firm of Johnson, Johnson and Roy, Landscape Architects from Ann Arbor, to design the Washington Avenue Mall and assist in coordinating development along the mall. The Redevelopment Board has also recommended to the City Council that Mr. J. Wesley Olds be hired as an architect to assist the businesses in the project area in meeting redevelopment proposals.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DEVELOPMENT.

The Lansing Community College plans to begin construction within the next 30 days on the \$5 million Liberal Arts Building to be constructed on the West side of the 400 block of N. Washington Avenue. This will be the first building under construction in the downtown Urban Renewal Project and is scheduled for completion by the beginning of the school year of September, 1968.

PROJECT NO. 2

The City is still without approval from the Department of Housing and Urban Development on Project No. 2 which provides for expansion of the Lansing Community College and redevelopment of Larch-Cedar Street area between Michigan Avenue and Saginaw Street. The Project approval has been held up due to lack of funds of the Federal Agency although approval is hoped for in the near future now that the next Fiscal Appropriation has been approved by Congress.

ORDINANCE

Mr. Siebert advised that the Zoning Ordinance is completed except for the map, and report of the consulting attorney.

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus that the Zoning Ordinance be forwarded to City Council with revisions at this time. After the attorney's report, and the map are completed, they will then be forwarded.

Mr. Fink stated that the Executive Committee meeting, on August 15th discussed the letter of transmittal, and suggested that their recommendations become a part of the letter.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

FINANCE

Motion by Fink, seconded by Gaus that \$2,300.00 be transferred from the 170 110 full time salaries account to the part time salaries account 170 122. This transfer is necessary because of the shortage of full time staff, requiring the utilization of part time personnel during the summer months.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

PLANNING DIRECTORS REPORT

Z-111-66

Discussed a letter addressed to the Mayor and City Council. Had been received from Mr. Kenneth Black, relative to the rezoning of the property at 925 W. Hillsdale, and upon which the City Council held a public hearing on Monday, August 15th.

The Board asked that a reproduced copy of the letter be forwarded to each member for their perusal.

OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

Z-39-66

Mr. Axel Bloomquist had submitted a letter of protest relative to the conditions around her property at 4818 S. Cedar St. Mrs. Bloomquist was present, and explained to the Board the use of property abutting hers for a parking area.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee with the petitioner to get a written report of their findings.

Mr. Gaus asked that if the buyer interested in her property in March, was still interested, and was advised that he is not and has purchased elsewhere.

Mr. Fink questioned where the area was.

Z-75-66

The letter from Mr. Leo Farhat, relative to his reasons for requesting that the Planning Committee of Council to refer the petition to rezone the property in the 900 block of W. Miller Road back to the Planning Board.

This was tabled.

SS-7-66

A letter from the Historical Society of Michigan, presenting the proposal for the relocation of the Olds Mansion was read.

The recommendation of the Buildings and Property Committee was read.

Motion by Manz, seconded by Fink, that the Board recommend to City Council that they have considered at length the proposed relocation of the R. E. Olds home to the park land at the foot of Capitol Avenue where the Barnes mansion was located.

It is the feeling of the Board that the proposed site is less objectionable than other suggested locations and reluctantly recommend approval of the character, location and extent of the westerly portion of Lot 17, Block 177, Original Plat of the City of Lansing as the site for the relocation of the R. E. Olds home.

This approval to be contingent upon confirmation and approval by the Park Board.

Some discussion was held on the letter received from Mr. Black relative to this matter. Mr. Fink asked if this could be attached to the recommendation. It was the consensus of the Board that a copy of the letter be attached to the recommendation to Council with no comments.

Mr. Reynolds asked about maintenance, and was advised that the Building will be taken care of by the Historical Society and the site by the Parks and Recreation Department.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

A letter from the Civil Rights Commission has been received. The letter and the enclosed report are to be placed on file.

The Secretary called the Board's attention to an article in the Monday, August 15th, issue of the Wall Street Journal relative to State zoning policies.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Motion by Fink, seconded by Siebert, that the Secretary contact the Traffic Board to arrange a joint meeting to discuss the coordination of future land use development projects with traffic needs, in the Central City. Particularly where the uses involve the Lansing Community College, the State Capitol, Ottawa Street bridge and alignment, Urban Renewal No. 2, and proposed future urban renewal projects.

Some discussion on the Ottawa Street extension was held.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Meeting adjourned at 12:05 A.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

C/M

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, September 6, 1966

Meeting was called to order at 7:41 P.M.
by Chairman Ramona Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino,
Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Abset: Fink and Manz—2.

Mrs. Bretz presented an outline of the
meeting.

HEARINGS

S-2-65 Prawdzik Subdivision

Mr. D. Gregory Main, Planner, gave a
presentation concerning the surrounding
area and its present use.

Mr. Ted Prawdzik, the developer, of 3131
W. Mt. Hope stated he needed 66 foot width
street, but has been unable to make ar-
rangements with the neighbor.

Mr. Black asked for a clarification on
the size of the lots, and the street design.
Some discussion was held on the lots and
the surrounding property.

Mr. Heino asked if the Zoning Ordinance
state specifically the depth needed for the
lots, and was advised that it did not.

Mrs. Marjorie Gruger, 612 N. Pine Street,
appeared and stated that she owns property
to the west (3223 W. Mt. Hope). Mrs.
Kruger mentioned offers to buy her prop-
erty. She stated she thought the lots could
be deeper. She doesn't want the roads
blocked off. She mentioned the accesses
needed for sewer and water.

The Secretary asked Mrs. Kruger if she
had a time table for development. She
mentioned other offers to purchase that
were not completed. She also mentioned
offers of developers that wanted her to
mortgage the property.

Mrs. Bretz asked if there were four
owners in this area and was advised there
are five.

Mr. Jack M. Short, of 3201 Glasgow
Drive, asked if these two people do not get
together enough land to develop, what will
happen to the proposed Outlot A and
what use could be put on it in the future?
Would it be waste land?

The Secretary advised that he felt certain
that all land would eventually be developed.
He further advised on the state law require-
ments for street. Discussion on possible
developments and speculation on what
might be developed followed.

Matter was referred to the Streets Com-
mittee.

S-13-66 Rensen Center

Mr. D. Gregory Main, Planner, gave an
explanation of the development surrounding
the area.

Mr. Henry Reniger, Jr. appeared and
advised he had no comments, but would
answer any questions.

The Secretary asked if they anticipated
any industrial uses on the Plat, Mr. Ren-
iger replied that it would be developed for
retail sales and warehouse type of opera-
tions.

Mr. Bill Sheathem 4921 Devonshire
stated that his back property would abut
Trantor St. extended, and wanted to ask
if the developer would provide adequate
buffers between their property and the po-
posed subdivision. He mentioned his con-
cern that the type of buyers might not be
what the developer might want. He stated
he felt this was to close to residential. He
further voiced his concern of rail spurs ex-
tensions.

The Secretary advised that the buffer
would be along the one access on the west
side along Jolly Road for approximately
400 feet. He further added that the property
is now zoned "H" light industrial, which
would allow manufacturing uses. This plat
has access only to Jolly Road. There will
be no traffic on the residential streets. The
developer feels that this is a reasonable
use of the land and that the retail use
would be better than using the land for a
manufacturing operations. The rail spur

could be introduced into the plat. This could be done regardless of the approval of the plat.

Mr. Sheathelm asked about a clarification of the buffer zone. Further discussion was held.

Mrs. McKim, who stated she was a developer of Pleasant Ridge, mentioned she has five lots that are vacant. The lots in her subdivision were made deep for this reason, to make more depth between them and what might develop to the East. She asked if the proposed industrial lots should be deeper and require some setback? She thought that a little more space would be desirable. She mentioned another area where buildings were close to the street. She thought something should be written into the deed requiring and restricting more space between the buildings and the residential.

Mr. Reniger stated they anticipate a 25 ft. setback on the front. Adequate drives and parking has not been settled as yet. Basically, it will be set up like most warehouse subdivisions.

Mr. Reynolds asked if Trantor street was developed through to this property, and was advised it is. He then asked if the road might be moved. Mr. Reniger stated that would leave them land locked. Trantor St. goes to the railroad on the north. They have 96 ft. width.

Mr. Lloyd Austin, 5015 Devonshire, reported that the extension of Trantor St. would pass his property onto Jolly Road, and wondered about the proposed grades. He wondered if the road would be built up. He mentioned some misunderstanding about the uses permitted here when he purchased his home, and stated his concern about the possible height.

Mrs. Bretz advised that the buildings can be three stories high.

Mr. Reniger added that they anticipate the buildings not to exceed 10,000 square feet. They could be developed as the home office or headquarters for small business of 10,000 less square feet.

The Secretary advised Mr. Austin, on the elevation of the road, he might obtain the answers to his question by contacting the Public Service Department.

Mr. Neil Post wondered about the control of junky house keeping. The Secretary advised that this would be the responsibility of the developer. The City cannot control housekeeping unless it is a public nuisance or a health hazard.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

Z-136-66

Mr. Paul F. Osborn, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at

6900-6928 S. Cedar Street, from "A" residential to "F" commercial district. Mr. Osborn stated that this piece of property was zoned commercial when outside the city. He is particularly interested in getting Lot 78 and lot 58 rezoned commercial. The proposed use is a used car lot.

Mr. Gaus asked if it is used for a car lot now, and was advised that it is not.

Mr. Siebert asked if there were a beauty shop? Mr. Osborn advised that Lot 78 was used for a car lot, and is now a beauty shop. This is to be moved to Lot 58, and a larger office is to be put on the property.

Mr. Heino asked if there were plans for the other lot? Mr. Osborn reported the house is to stay. They have no plans for the other lots.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-137-66

Mr. Bryon D. Babcock, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 3523 North East Street, from "A" one family to "G-2" wholesale district. Mr. Babcock advised he proposes to put an appliance repair and wholesale store in this location. This was a former gasoline service station.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-138-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 908 E. Kalamazoo Street, from "C" two family to "F" commercial district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-139-66

Mr. Edgar L. Church, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 6000 block Pleasant Street described as:

That part of Lot No. 23, Bliesener Subdivision, a part of the S. $\frac{1}{2}$ of the S.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the S.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 6, T3N, R2W, Delhi Township, Ingham County, Michigan described as follows:

Commencing at the N.W. corner of said Lot No. 23, thence south 90 ft. along the west side of Pleasant St., thence easterly to the most westerly corner of Lot No. 13, thence N. 44 degrees 30 seconds E. 125 ft. to the N.E. corner of said Lot No. 23, thence westerly 182.2 ft. on the north line of said Lot No. 23 to the point of beginning

from "A" one family residential to "G-2" wholesale district. Mr. Church stated that the legal is incorrect, and was advised to submit a letter to Council correcting the legal.

Mr. Church advised that he is one of the owners. When the property was purchased it was in Delhi Township and was zoned commercial. Upon annexation, the zoning was changed to "A" one single family. He mentioned surrounding uses of property in the M-99 area. Plans and specifications will be submitted to the Board.

Mr. Reynolds asked if Lots 12 and 11 had anything on them and was advised that they are vacant. South of Lot 23 is also vacant.

Mr. Siebert asked about the unnumbered triangle, and was advised that this is owned by the owners of Lots 11 and 12.

Mr. Black asked if they intend to have driveways from Pleasant St. as well as Logan, and Mr. Clyde Olin stated that this is their intention.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-140-66

Mr. Camille Abood, appeared for Mrs. Hildry Williams the owner of the I & H Grill in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 611 S. Butler Blvd., from "A" one family to "F" commercial district. Mr. Abood told of the plight of Mrs. Williams and the necessity for her to move.

After some discussion, it was determined that this would be a mute hearing inasmuch as the property is already zoned "F" commercial which would meet Mrs. Williams needs. Mr. Wilbert Middleton, owner of the property stated that the request for withdrawal will be submitted.

Z-141-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property east of 1826 Dell Road described as:

Lot 1 of Hartland Subdivision a Replat of part of Lot 19 and part of Lot 18 and part of Outlot "A" of Maple Grove Subdivision, a part of the E. $\frac{1}{2}$ of S.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 10, T3N, R2W, Delhi Township, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-142-66

Mr. Fred S. Vorn, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 100 block of East Saginaw Street described as:

Commencing at the N.W. corner of Lot 1, Block 53, Original Plat thence S. 11 rods; thence E. 7 rods, thence N. 103.75 ft., thence W. $4\frac{1}{2}$ rods; thence N. 77.75 ft.; thence W. $2\frac{1}{2}$ rods to the point of beginning

Also the W. 136 ft. of the S. 5 rods of the N. 16 rods of Lot 1, Block 53, Original Plat, City of Lansing. Also the S. $26\frac{1}{2}$ ft. of Lot 4 and the N. 20 ft. of Lot 3, Block 53, Original Plat, City of Lansing. To include any and all driveway rights of record, and subject to restrictions, rights and easement of record

Also that part of Lot 1, Block 53, of the Original Plat, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, according to the plat thereof recorded in Liber 2 of Plats, Page 36, 37 and 38, Ingham County Records described as:

Beginning at a point which is W 173.25 ft. and N. 41.25 ft. from the intersection of the centerline of Saginaw Street and the centerline of Grand Avenue, extended, thence N. a distance of 123.75 ft.; thence E. a distance of 99 ft.; thence S. a distance of 123.75 ft., to the North line of Saginaw Street; thence W. a distance of 99 ft. to the point of beginning.

from "H" light industrial to "G" business district. Mr. Vorn advised he is co-owner of the property with J. C. Walters. The request is two fold. The property is now zoned "H" and he feels the Board has no desire to leave this zoning as is, as it is a nice piece of property. The reason for wanting the rezoning is because of soil borings. They found it not to be in very good condition. A one story building would require quite a bit of piling. The cost of the piling makes it uneconomical. They have in mind a four story building with a basement approximately 50,000 square feet for office space. A good portion is to be occupied by J. C. Walters. During the last three months they have had offers from three oil companies for service stations. They want to beautify this space along the river. They own about 60% of the entire block surrounded by Washington, Saginaw, Grand and Madison and want to develop all of it in a course of time. Mr. Vorn stated that his second request was for expedience. He mentioned earlier appearances before the Board of Zoning Appeals. They have a builder waiting. The urgency is for the J. C. Walters Co. to move and he asked that anything that could be done to expedite this would be appreciated. He further mentioned a tenant that is being displaced. On the parking will have one space for every 300 ft. of office space.

Mr. Black asked for a site plan on the curb cuts. Mr. Vorn replied that they have three curb cuts with a right-of-way off Grand Ave. and one off Saginaw St. and one on Madison Ave.

Mrs. Bretz stated, "that a site plan for parking is being asked for."

Further discussion was held, and the petitioners were advised to write a letter to Council amending the petition to include recently acquired property.

Mr. Siebert asked the approximate size of the building, and was advised that it would be 63 by 167.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-143-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 1406 Sunset Avenue, from "A" one family residential to "J" parking district.

The matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-144-66

Mr. Melvin R. Barnes, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 6615 S. Pennsylvania Avenue, from "A" one family to "G-2" wholesale district. Mr. Barnes advised that he had recently acquired another 33 ft. to the North. His property is non-conforming. This newly acquired property has not been used for anything but farm land. He would like to use this property for his trailer sales. He has owned the trailer sales for many years.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-145-66

Mr. Harry C. Berger, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 3717 S. Pennsylvania Avenue, from "D-M" multiple dwelling to "G-2" wholesale district, and stated that his business is office machines. They have purchased this anticipating future development. 200 ft. is now commercial and 100 ft. is multiple dwelling. Would like it all rezoned alike. Have not too many plans as yet.

Mr. Heino asked if they would continue on their present business and was advised that they would.

Mrs. McKim stated she believed there was a set-back restriction on buildings close to the homes.

Mr. Clyde Olin stated there is a 50 ft. setback.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-146-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 4501 S. Pennsylvania Avenue, from "A" one family to "C" two family residence.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-147 and 148-66

Shelby Wagoner appeared in behalf of the petitions to rezone the properties at the N.E. corner of Miller Road and Waverly Road described as:

Beginning at a point at the S.W. corner of Section 6, T3N, R2W, Delhi Township, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan thence North 655.0 ft. along the west line of said section to a point; thence East 370.0 feet to a point; thence S. 51° 08' 24" E. 475.15 feet to a point; thence South 360.0 feet to a point on the Southerly line of said section; thence N. 89° 45' 30" W. 740.0 feet along the southerly line of said section to the point of beginning, containing 9.84 acres more or less including public right-of-way on Waverly Road and Miller Road

from "A" one family to "F" commercial district and

Land in Section 6, T3N, R2W, Delhi Township, City of Lansing Ingham County, Michigan described as follows: Beginning at a point located North 655.0 feet from the S.W. corner of said section and on the westerly line of said section, being the center line of Waverly Road, thence continuing North along the Westerly line of said Section 328.2 feet; thence S. 89° 51' 30" E. 465.0 ft. to a point; thence S. 55° 43' 33" E. 900 ft. to a point; thence S. 25° 46' 20" E. 115.0 feet to a point; thence S. 00° 12' 30" W. 375.0 ft. to a point on the southerly line of said section being the center line of Miller Road; thence North 89° 45' 30" W. 516.0 feet to a point; thence North 360.0 feet to a point; thence N. 51° 08' 24" W. 475.15 ft. to a point; thence West 370 feet to the point of beginning containing 13 acres more or less including right-of-way on Miller Road and Waverly Road,

from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district. Mr. Wagoner stated that this is an overall project development of the area. They intend to use this property as a self containing project with single family, multiple family and commercial.

Mr. Reynolds asked if all lots were adjoining and was advised that they did to the North and to the East.

Mr. Heino asked how many lots and was advised there are approximately 13 acres. Development in this area is far in the future.

Mr. Gaus asked the proposed use for the commercial corner and was advised that it will be developed perhaps five years from now.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-149-66

Mr. Camille Abood, appeared for Ivan V. Bartha in behalf of the petition to rezone the property abutting North of 820 N. Sycamore Street described as:

All that part of Lots 21 and 22 of Block No. 1 of O. F. Barnes Subdivision on Block 27, Original Plat, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan which lies southeasterly of a line 45 feet of (measured at right angles) and parallel to a line described as:

Beginning at a point on the centerline of Chicago Avenue which is 20 feet North along said centerline from its intersection with the centerline of Oakland Avenue; thence South 88° 27' 32" East, parallel with the centerline of Oakland Avenue, a distance of 223.20 feet to the point of curvature of a 1145.92 foot radius curve to the left (chord bearing North 81° 00' 35" East); thence Northeasterly along the arc of said curve 421.25 feet to the point of tangency of said curve; thence North 70° 28' 43" East a distance of 278.61 feet to the point of curvature of a 1145.92 foot radius curve to the right (chord bearing North 81° 02' 35" East); thence East along the arc of said curve 422.58 feet to the point of tangency of said curve and a point of ending.

from "C" two family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district and advised that there is also a 20 x 80 ft. strip to the South available to the developer. He further stated that the developer wishes to plan and develop this parcel containing 9,000 square feet into a small multiple dwelling. This is approximately two or three blocks from St. Lawrence Hospital, and close to the Community College. The time schedule for development is one year or by the spring of 1967. He stated he thought there was a need for multiple housing in this area. He believes the development of this land would have egress and ingress limited to Leonard Court or Sycamore St. rather than on the highway. Plans will be submitted.

Mr. Heino asked the number of units, and was advised they would like to have

8 units. They can acquire the additional land if the Board feels it is necessary.

Mr. Block asked if the developer ever tried to develop a site plan for this site. The setback and yard requirements would leave very little room for buildings and parking.

Mr. Abood stated he will ask the developer to submit a site plan and asked that the petition be tabled until the plans are submitted.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-150-66

Mr. John Eliasohn appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 2325 S. Cedar Street from "D-M" multiple dwelling to "D-1" professional offices district. Mr. Eliasohn reported that he owns the lot adjoining which is vacant has been used for parking for the past 14 to 15 years. The basis for the request is that he is in the process of remodeling. They want to tear down a garage and want to build an addition on the present office space. Garage which is attached is delapidated.

Mr. Heino asked if the petitioner had any objection to rezoning Lot 22 for parking. Mr. Eliasohn replied that it was used by his customers and if zoned for parking would have to be black topped and this does not warrant that much use. He wouldn't want to go to the expense if it is not necessary. He presented a sketch of the lot.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-151-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 641 East Jolly Road, from "A" one family residential to "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

The matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Recess from 9:31 to 10:14 P.M.

BUSINESS SESSION

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Siebert that the minutes of August 2, 1966 be approved.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Board authorized the Staff to set public hearings on the zoning petitions Z-81-66, 1218 W. Jolly Road, and Z-154-66, 300 Blk. W. Jolly Road for the closest board meeting date after the plans had been filed, allowing the 15 day notice to property owners.

An explanation of the Zoning process was given by the Board Chairman.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-97-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the request for withdrawal of the petition by Erwin Dale Mulder to rezone a parcel in the 2900 Blk. N. East Street described as:

(1) 2923 No. East Street—The North 42 ft. of Lot 2, Supervisor's plat of community home sites, Lansing Township, Ingham County, Michigan

(2) Lot North—All that part of Lot 3, Supervisor's plat of community home sites of a part of the S.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the N.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 4, T4N, R2W, Lansing Township, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one family to "F" commercial district be accepted and that the property remain in its present classification.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-103-66

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Gaus, that the petition by St. Michael's Episcopal Church to rezone a parcel at 2709 Eifert Road from "A" one family to "B" one family be removed from the table.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Motion by Siebert, second by Heino that the petition be tabled to the September 20th Board meeting.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-112-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Donald Miles to rezone a parcel at 3413 West Jolly Road from "A-1" family to "D-M" multiple district be denied.

1. The change would create an isolated district unrelated to similar districts, i.e. this would be a "spot-zone."
2. Where all zones about single family development the latter, is subject to adverse influences, such as: increased noise and activity, additional traffic and larger buildings.
3. The change will adversely affect property values in the adjacent area and may, therefore, deter the improvement or development of adjacent properties. It would also minimize the future development of adjacent areas in accord with existing zoning regulations.

4. There are several lots in this area that would have to be given the same consideration if this lot were rezoned.

5. The proposal, instead of adding tax base to the City of Lansing, may foster uncontrolled apartment development leading to mixed and undesirable land uses which would encourage blight and reduce the tax base of the area.

The Secretary presented a letter received from Thomas J. and Marian Ward expressing their concern.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-120-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Byron T. and M. Jean Bradley to rezone a parcel at 2721 N. Grand River Ave. described as:

The East 100 ft. of that part of the West 40 acres of the West $\frac{1}{2}$ of the Southeast $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 5, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan lying North of the Manufacturer's Railroad and South of the Center of Highway known as Grand River Avenue

from "A-1" family to "F" commercial district be denied as filed and that:

"The North 225 ft., except the North 50 ft. thereof lying parallel to Grand River Ave."

be rezoned from "D-M" multiple to "F" commercial district

"The West 20 ft., and the West 20 ft. of the East 30 ft. of the North 50 ft. lying parallel to Grand River Ave."

be rezoned from "D-M" multiple to "J" parking district and

"The balance of the North 50 ft. lying parallel to North Grand River Ave."

be rezoned from "D-M" multiple to "A-1" family district.

The proposed use (Day Care Nursery for pre-school children) would provide a proper transition between the commercial use to the east and the potential residential use to the west.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-127-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the request for withdrawal of the petition by John P. Williams to rezone a parcel at 600 S. Logan from "E-1" drive-in shop to "F" commercial district be accepted and that the property remain in its classification.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-128-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Gross Telecasting, Inc. Harold and Charlotte Gross to rezone a parcel in the 2800 Block of East Saginaw Street described as:

Com at in'n S. line E. Saginaw St. and N. and S. $\frac{1}{4}$ line Section 14, in E'y along S. line E. Saginaw St. 375 ft., S. par'l to N. and S. $\frac{1}{4}$ line 480 ft., W'y 375 ft. plus/minus point in N. and S. $\frac{1}{4}$ line 480 ft. S. of beg., N. to beg. section 14, T4N, R2W and

Com. 375 ft. S. 89° 37' E. and 520 ft. S. 0° 18' W. of N. $\frac{1}{4}$ post Section 14, thence N. par'l to N. and S. $\frac{1}{4}$ line 480 ft. to S. line East Saginaw St., E'y 172.64 ft. along S. line E. Saginaw St. to W. line Howard St. S'y along W. line Howard St. 700 ft. N. 89° 54' 30" W. 549.80 ft. plus/minus to N. and S. $\frac{1}{4}$ line Section 14, N'y along $\frac{1}{4}$ line to point 520 ft. S. of N. $\frac{1}{4}$ post Section 14, E'y 375 ft. to beg., Section 14, T4N, R2W,

from "A" residential to "F" commercial district be considered for approval, after a plot plan is submitted showing the minimum of 2:1 ratio of parking to commercial, and approved by the Planning Board.

The use on the site is non-conforming and requires an "F" commercial zoning before any alterations or repairs.

The existing use does not appear to have an adverse effect on the adjacent residential properties.

The site has access to two primary thoroughfares. Land use conditions have changed in the immediate area.

"F" commercial zoning does not insure adequate off-street parking.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-129-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Board recommend to City Council that

the petition by Geert Mulder to rezone a parcel in the 3400 Block Burchfield described as:

Lot 9, 10, and 11, outlot B, Supervisors Plat of Burchfield Subdivision, Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A-1" family to "C" two family district be denied.

1. The proposed change would be contrary to the established Land Use Pattern which is single family.
2. The change will adversely affect living conditions in the immediate area, principally through the measure of traffic and activity. This is especially true if all other vacant properties were considered for an increase in density.
3. This change would alter the character of the district. Each lot would contain two families or double the number of dwelling units per acre. This would in turn double the number of automobiles, the number of trips on the street and could possibly double the number of school children in the area. Lansing neighborhoods produce one child per dwelling unit in neighborhoods of this type. There is no reason to believe that a two family home would be any exception. The character of the entire street could be further affected by inducing a change from single family homes which are usually owned by the occupants to two family dwellings which are traditionally rental units.
4. The basic land use conditions have not changed in this area, or has development been contrary to existing regulations.
5. There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be developed in accord with existing zoning regulations.
6. The change would alter the population density pattern and thereby increase the load on public facilities, (schools, sewers and streets) This is especially true if the entire area was changed.
7. The spot-zoning of the center of a neighborhood is against all planning precepts.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—5.

Nays: None.

Z-130-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Vernon J. Andrews Attorney, for Pete and Virginia Spagnuolo to rezone a parcel at 816 E. Howe St. from

"A" one family to "H" light industrial district be granted and further recommends that

"Lot No. 22 Elmore M. Hunt Sub-division"

be rezoned from "A" one family to "H" light industrial district.

The Board believes that because of the mixed commercial and industrial land uses that have been allowed to develop in this area, it would be unreasonable to assume this property would develop in residential. These uses were established prior to annexation to the City of Lansing, under the Industrial Zoning in Lansing Township.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-131-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Richard Peacock and Allen Parks to rezone a parcel at 617 Seymour Ave. from "D-M" multiple to "D-1" professional district be denied.

1. The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as residential.
2. Central City studies of this area indicate development should be residential two story townhouses.
3. This request would constitute a "spot-zone" inconsistent with existing and proposed development.
4. The basic land use conditions have not changed in this area, therefore, there are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be used under the existing zoning.
5. The recent studies for the development of the Central City show the concentration of this type of use further to the south. There is also land zoned in the immediate area that would accommodate the proposed use.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-132-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Betty M. Brennan to rezone a parcel at 2801 N. East St. described as:

Com. 33 ft. W. and 77 ft. S. of E. $\frac{1}{4}$ post Section 4, thence S. on W. line N. East St. 90 ft. W. 157 ft. N. 90 ft. E. 157 Ft. to beg. (exc land used for street purposes, Section 4, T4N, R2W)

from "A" one family to "C" two family districts be granted. Further recommends that the property immediately to the North described as:

Com. 33 ft. W. of E. $\frac{1}{4}$ Post Section 4, thence W. 153 ft., S. 77 ft., E. 153 ft., N. 77 ft. to beginning exc land used for street purposes. Section 4, T4N, R2W

be rezoned from "A" one family to "C" two family.

1. The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as residential.
2. The mixed commercial uses in the area and the property having frontage on a major thoroughfare, has made the property less desirable for single family use.
3. The rezoning will allow some relief from the undesirable land uses in the area and the high volume of traffic on north East Street.
4. The rezoning could establish a trend along this area of north East Street that would be a basis for discouraging future strip commercial development.
5. The lot will permit increase in dwelling unit without overcrowding the land. (12,420 sq. ft.)

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-133-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by John J. Richards to rezone a parcel at 5843 and 5831 S. Logan Street from "A-1" family to "F" commercial district as filed be denied and the properties be zoned "C" two family.

The Board believes that this will allow reasonable use of the land and establish a trend along the area of Logan Street that could otherwise develop in strip commercial.

1. The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as residential.
2. The change would adversely affect adjacent residential properties principally through the increase of traffic and activity.

3. Lansing's Master Plan definitely recommends discouraging strip commercial development along Logan Street.
4. The commercial use that now exists on the property can continue under the non-conforming status.
5. The change would be contrary to the established land use pattern of the area which is predominately residential.
6. The change may adversely affect property values in the vicinity and may deter the improvement of adjacent properties in accord with the existing regulations.

Mr. Gaus asked why the rezoning to "C" two family, why not let it remain in "A" one family?

Mr. Reynolds mentioned the study of Logan St. He suggested that maybe the Board should look into keeping this residential.

Mr. Black called attention to the Staff Analysis relative to the widening of Logan Street and the traffic.

Mrs. Bretz mentioned that the Board had set a policy of no commercial on Logan St. past a certain area. The Zoning Committee felt this is not a desirable location for "A" one family, and this would give some higher use to the land.

Mr. Gaus then asked if this is something that the petitioner needs?

Further discussion followed.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-135-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino that the petition by Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox Church to rezone a parcel in the 700 Blk. of E. Saginaw Street described as:

Commencing on North line of East Saginaw Street 350 ft. East of East line of Marshall Street, thence North parallel to Marshall Street to a point 450 feet South of South line of East Grand River Avenue, thence East parallel to East Grand River Avenue to a point 99.6 feet West of East line of Section 10, thence South parallel to East line of Section 10 to North line of East Saginaw Street, thence West to point of beginning, Section 10, T4N, R2W

from "B" one family to "D-1" professional offices district be tabled for thirty days.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-136-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino that the petition by Paul F. Osborn to rezone a parcel at 6900-6928 S. Cedar Street from "A" residential to "T" commercial be tabled until the September 20th meeting.

Z-39-66

The Secretary was directed to write a letter to Mrs. Axel Bloomquist relative to the parking conditions behind her home at 4318 S. Cedar St.

Z-188-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the petition by the Walter Neller Company to rezone a parcel at 6326 S. Cedar Street, from "A" one family to Community Unit Plan, as revised, be tabled to the September 20th meeting.

Mrs. Bretz also called the Board's attention to the fact that a letter from the State Highway Department had been received relative to this zoning matter.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

STREETS COMMITTEE

S-3-66F

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds, that the Board recommend to City Council that the Final Plat of Cushion Replat be approved subject to the following conditions:

All public improvements shall be installed with complete public utilities including water, sanitary sewers, storm sewers and full street improvements including street paving, curb and gutter, sidewalks and such other improvements as required under Section VI D of Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

The posting of financial security, as outlined in Section VI B Lansing Subdivision Regulations in the amount of:

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Monument Deposit | \$ 80.00 |
| Sanitary Sewers | 2,000.00 |
| Total | \$2,080.00 |

prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

All other standards and requirements of the Michigan State Plat Act, Act 172, Public Act of 1929 as amended shall apply.

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. Reynolds reported that the Board was trying to arrange for a walkway from the parking lot to Washington Avenue.

PLANNING DIRECTORS REPORT

The Secretary advised that Mr. Martin Crampton, will be joining the Staff as a Senior Planner, about November 1st, Mr. Crampton's background was presented.

OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

Z-75-66

A letter has been received from Mr. Leo Farhat relative to why he desired the Planning Board to reconsider the rezoning of the property in the 900 blk. W. Miller Road.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

SS-7-66

The letter from the Historical Society of Michigan relative to the Olds Mansion was received.

NEW BUSINESS

Misc-3-65

McCourt St. naming matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

BP-18-66

This matter was referred to the Buildings and Properties Committee.

Mr. Black reminded the Board that the option was binding only until September 8th, and asked if this will hamper the Council action.

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that the Board recommend to City Council that the acquisition and development of Jones Lake, for park purposes, was approved as to location, character, and extent, by the Planning Board in their meeting on September 6 1,966.

The park site is in accord with, and recommended by the Master Plan. It will serve an expanding population in future years.

The Boards recommendation was by unanimous vote.

The American Society of Planning Officials meeting to be held in Petoskey October 5, 6, and 7, was mentioned, and the Board were urged to attend if possible.

Meeting adjourned at 10:55 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

T/C

Letters of Intent from Lurea Builders to construct curb and gutter, and grade and gravel in certain streets in Rivers Edge No. 1 and for certain lots on Maybel Street in Churchill Downs Nos. 1 and 3; and from the Simken Corporation to grade and gravel, construct curb and gutter and storm and sanitary sewers in Simken Drive in Simken Village.

Motion by Mr. Russell supported by Mrs. Borgman that the Board recommend that the requests be approved subject to the receipt of the necessary bonds.

Carried.

Committee report from the Committee on Streets and Sidewalks to whom was referred matter of a Scott Park Drive, recommending that the Board of Public Service approve a park drive connecting Capitol Avenue and William Street with the final location and grades to be determined after a detailed survey has been made.

Motion by Mr. Mosher supported by Mr. Russell that the report of the committee be accepted.

Carried.

Mr. Russell reported on the various Urban Renewal Projects.

Letter from Gordon Stafford, Sewage Plant Superintendent, reporting on the Sewage Plant breakdown September 22, 1966.

Received and placed on file.

Letter from Gordon Stafford, Sewage Plant Superintendent, requesting permission to send six men to the annual Waste Water Treatment meeting at Gull Lake on October 18 and 19 and at Flint November 8 and 9, 1966.

Motion by Mr. Russell supported by Mr. Mosher that the request be approved.

Carried.

Director of Public Service reported on the various activities of the department.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM C. WAIDELICH,
Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, September 20, 1966

Meeting was called to order by Chairman Ramona J. Bretz at 8:05 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Absent: None.

The Chairman explained the procedures followed by the Planning Board.

BUSINESS SESSION

It was moved by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the minutes of August 16, 1966 be approved.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-221-65

Motion by Fink, seconded by Reynolds, that a joint hearing be held by the City Council and the Planning Board to consider a revised Community Unit Plan known as "Vincent Court" located at 4631 and 4705 South Logan Street, October 6, 1966 at 7:30 P.M. in the Council Chambers.

Motion carried by a seven (7) yeas, one (1) nay vote.

Z157-66

A public hearing is to be held by the Planning Board on a Community Unit Plan at 3535 Moores River Drive petitioned by Beneicke and Krue of Detroit on October 18, 1966 at 7:30 P.M.

Mr. Fink requested that when the plans are formalized on Z-157-66 and Z-221-65, they be sent to the Board members 10 days in advance of the hearing date so they might review them.

An explanation of the Zoning Process was given by the Secretary.

Z-142-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by J. C. Walters and Fred S. Vorn to rezone a parcel in the 100 block of East Saginaw Street described as:

Parcel I: Commencing at the N.W. corner of Lot 1, Block 53, Original Plat, thence South 11 rods; thence E. 7 rods, thence N. 103.75 feet; thence W. $4\frac{1}{2}$ rods; thence N. 77.75 feet; thence W. $2\frac{1}{2}$ rods to the point of beginning; City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

Parcel II: Also the West 136 feet of the S. 5 rods of the N. 16 rods of Lot 1, Block 53, Original Plat, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

Parcel III: Also the S. $26\frac{1}{2}$ feet of Lot 4 and the N. 20 feet of Lot 3 Block 53, Original Plat, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan to include any and all driveway rights of record; and subject to restrictions, rights and easements of record.

Parcel IV: All that part of Lot 1, Block 53 of the Original Plat, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, according to the plat thereof recorded in Liber 2 of Plats, page 36, 37 and 38, Ingham County Records, described as: Beginning at a point which is West 173.25 feet and North 41.25 feet from the intersection of the centerline of Saginaw Street and the centerline of Grand Avenue, extended: thence North a distance of 123.75 feet; thence East a distance of 99 feet; thence North a distance of 123.75 feet; thence East a distance of 99 feet; thence South a distance of 123.75 feet, to the North line of Saginaw Street; thence West a distance of 99 feet to the point of beginning.

Parcel V: Commencing $2\frac{1}{2}$ rods East of the Northwest corner of Lot 1, Block 53, thence South 77.75 feet, thence East 74.25 feet, thence North 77.75 feet, thence East 74.25 feet, thence North 77.75 feet, thence West 74.25 feet to place of beginning, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, subject to easements and restrictions of record.

Parcel VI: Commencing at the Southeast corner of Lot No. 2 of Block No. 53, Original Plat, City of Lansing, thence North to Northeast

corner of Lot No. 2, thence East 2 rods, thence South to a point directly East of beginning, thence West 2 rods to the of the place of beginning, thence West 2 rods to the beginning.

from "H" light industrial to "G" business district be denied as filed. The Planning Board further recommends that the property be rezoned from "H" light industrial to "D-1" professional offices, and that the Secretary be directed to forward to the Board of Zoning Appeals the Planning Board's feeling on this request.

The Board is not adverse to office use on this site, but believes that general business with 120 ft. height limitation, would not be in the best interest of the City or in accordance with good planning principals.

Mr. Leo Farhat stated that he had been contacted late in the afternoon by Mr. Vorn to discuss the status of this petition. Wanted to know whether it was correct that the hearing has already been held and was informed that it was.

The motion was carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Abstain: Reynolds—1.

Z-136-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Paul F. Osborn to rezone a parcel at 6900-6928 South Cedar Street described as:

Lots 57, 58, 78, 79 and 80 of Just-A-Mere Farm Subdivision

from "A" one family residential district to "F" commercial district be denied as filed and further recommends that

Lots 58 and 78 except the easterly 30 feet thereof lying parallel to Cedar Street

be rezoned from "A" one family residence to "F" commercial and that the easterly 30 feet be rezoned from "A" one family to "J" parking.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-75-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the petition by Sam S. Bofysil, to re-

zone a parcel at 900 Block of Miller Road described as:

Lots 1, 2 and 3 of Southbrook Subdivision (formerly Delhi Township), City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A-1" family to "D-M" district be tabled for 30 days.

Mr. Fink stated that in the discussion that there was some comment that the reason being the possibility of the approval of the zoning ordinance amendment of the "D-M" multiple zoning district by City Council.

Mr. Guernsey stated that the City Council is currently considering an increase in the lot area per unit in the Zoning Ordinance. Discussion followed.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-128-66

Letter received from Leo Farhat concerning the property, located at 2820 E. Saginaw owned by Gross Telecasting, requesting that the requirements of the submission of a plot plan be waived and that the petition be considered upon its merits.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

STREETS COMMITTEE

SS-16-64

Discussed that the extension of Pleasant Grove remain on the table.

Misc-3-65

Discussed that the McCourt Street remain on the table.

ROW-22-66 Scott Park Drive

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Siebert, the Board recommend to City Council that the Scott Park Drive be disapproved for the following reasons:

The proposed drive would, due to its location, become a major artery between the Central business district, Oldsmobile, and the south and southwest sections of the City. It is unrealistic to expect the

proposed width (24 ft.) to be adequate to carry the traffic which would use this drive.

This drive would divide the park and gardens into two parts which would destroy its usefulness as a park, due to its detrimental effect on the beauty and openness of the interior of this park. It would also present a traffic hazard to pedestrians using the park and gardens.

A portion of the natural growth and plantings would have to be removed for the proposed drive and parking area.

The drive and parking area will reduce the amount of land presently reserved for passive recreation, not only by the width of the pavement, but also the immediate surroundings will be affected.

The addition of general city traffic into the Oldsmobile Complex would complicate and not help the traffic flow in this area.

That South Capitol and South Grand Avenues should be studied as possible connectors with South Washington, between Hillsdale and Main Streets, when the mall is developed on Washington Avenue.

Mr. Black stated that he would like to comment on item 6, and presented a proposal for bridge connector with I-496. His proposal was tabled until new business is considered.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Proposed Master Plan Amendment

It was moved by Gaus, seconded by Manz, that a public hearing on the proposed revision of the Comprehensive Master Plan for the City of Lansing, be held on Tuesday, October 18, 1966 at 7:30 P.M. in Municipal Court Room No. 1, 6th Floor of City Hall, Lansing, Michigan. The proposed revision deals with:

Standards for streets and roads as proposed by the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission for the Tri-County area. In that the terminology for the types of streets and roads and the cross sectional characteristics are different from those existing in the Master Plan, it would be desirable to update the Plan.

The motion was carried by a unanimous vote.

The meeting was recessed at 8:40 P.M.

Meeting called to order at 9:20 P.M.

FINANCE COMMITTEE

The Secretary reported that he received a check from the Housing Commission for slightly over \$800 for Staff work on housing sites. This payment should bring us up to date for the Staff time spent. The controller suggested that the check be put into a receivable account for the Board, and at some future time, when additional monies are needed for some part of the budget in terms of salaries or equipment, the money can be transferred from this separate cash account to it. Under the City Charter and the State Charter we are permitted to receive funds such as this.

Mr. Fink moved that the indicated funds from the housing commission be received.

Supported by Siebert.

Mr. Fink moved that formal procedures to receive these funds be established.

Motion carried unanimously.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Reviewed the status report of the Staff, and asked the Board to compare this report with previous reports.

Mr. Fink asked from where the funds for the Red Cedar Park would come, and was informed that 50 to 70% of the funds would come from federal open space monies. This is still under study.

Mr. Black noted that, in referring to the zoning ordinance part of the status report, it should be noted that it was referred to the Council August 16, 1966.

Mr. Fink asked about the Central City study. Mr. Guernsey stated that there is a meeting with Vilcan Leman September 22 which will be the last review before publication.

Mr. Fink asked whether this would require a public hearing, and was informed that the Central City Plan was proposed as an amendment to the Master Plan and that perhaps the hearing could be held at the same time as the Street Cross Sections amendment to the Master Plan.

Mr. Fink moved that the Board hold a public hearing on the Central City Study, Core Plan, a revision of the Master Plan on October 18, 1966. Mr. Black supported this.

Mr. Reynolds stated that the Board has already had a review of this.

Motion was carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Guernsey requested the Board approval of four staff members to attend the

MSPO Conference in Petoskey for one night and two days.

Mr. Fink asked if it were necessary to authorize specific funds for the staff members at this time, and was informed it could be at a later meeting.

Mr. Fink moved, seconded by Siebert, four staff members be authorized to attend the Michigan Society of Planning Officials in Petoskey, October 6 and 7, 1966.

The motion was carried by unanimous vote.

OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The Secretary reported on the letter from Axel Bloomquist concerning a land use violation at 4318 S. Cedar Street. The Building Inspector has checked the area and found it in violation and the matter is being acted upon by him.

NEW BUSINESS

Z-188-65 and Z-103-66

It was moved by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the matter be tabled until the October 4, 1966 meeting due to the time element.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Black submitted his report, on the Capitol and Grand Avenue bridge, to the Planning Board. It was referred to the Streets Committee for their comments on October 4, 1966.

Mr. Black commented that he had investigated, as a result of the Streets Committee meeting what was going to happen at the South end of Washington Avenue. He talked with the Highway Department, and other City Engineers.

He proposed an alternate plan of which copies were presented to the Board.

Considerable discussion followed.

Mr. Guernsey stated that he thought that this was an excellent proposal. A similar plan had been proposed to the Highway Department about 1½ to 2 years ago. Tomorrow there is to be a meeting with the Council's Public Service and Streets Committee, at which time the plan could be discussed.

Mr. Manz suggested that the proposal also be presented to the Traffic Department, and the Public Service Director.

The Secretary presented a letter from the American Institute of Architects on the Detroit Conference-Historic Preservation on September 30, through October 1, 1966 .

Mr. Manz stated that he was going to discuss at this meeting, the naming of the cross town freeway the R. E. Olds Freeway, but there was an article in the evening paper concerning this subject.

The Secretary reported that time has been spent with Mr. Mateer going to Washington and Chicago on public housing sites. The Staff feels that Creative Builders should not be considered favorably for low income housing. We should make our position known to the developer.

Mr. Fink questioned if this was in terms of site and building performance.

Further discussion followed.

Mr. Black moved that the Board meet as a committee of The Whole at 4:00 next Wednesday, September 28, 1966.

Mrs. Bretz stated that Mr. Guernsey's membership in the Chamber of Commerce has expired. She feels that someone in City Hall should be a member to the Chamber.

Mr. Manz stated that he felt the Mayor should appoint a person. Mr. Guernsey would perhaps be the best possible person. Suggested that Mrs. Bretz call the mayor.

Meeting adjourned at 10:05 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

C/M

be demolished without creating hardships or disrupting businesses.

It was moved by Hilley and supported by Reynolds that the Board recommend to the City Council to advertise for demolition bids on Parcels 5-16 (Phillips 66 Gas Station) and 4-3 (Weger Building).

Motion carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 9:55 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

URBAN REDEVELOPMENT
BOARD,

WINSTON E. FOLKERS,
Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, October 4, 1966

Meeting was called to order at 7:44 P.M. by Chairman Ramona J. Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Absent: Heino—1.

Mrs. Bretz gave an outline of the meeting.

HEARINGS

Z-81-66

Mr. Alan E. Tubbs, Planner, gave a description of the area and the proposed plan for the property at 1212 and 1218 W. Jolly Road, petitioned for rezoning from "A" residential to "D-M" multiple dwelling district; revised to Community Unit Plan.

Mr. Charles Felice, one of the owners, discussed the use of the lot next to the site.

Mr. Siebert asked the height of the proposed structure, and was informed it would be $2\frac{1}{2}$ stories. The area contains 1.02 acres.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-152-66

Mr. Joe D. Pentecost appeared for Peter D. and John T. Laboda in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 909 W. Holmes Road from "H" light industrial and "J" parking to "F" commercial district;

and reported that he holds an option on this property. They propose to construct a restaurant with a seating capacity of about 135. The building will be 50 feet x 53 feet. It is impossible to fit the building on the portion zoned "H". Aerial photo and plat plans were presented together with a floor plan showing the elevation. This will be a new cosmopolitan building for the Burger Chef. This is not a speculative matter as leases have been signed pending the rezoning.

Mr. Fink asked the amount of parking space. Mr. Pentecost advised that the building will be 50 feet x 53 feet leaving approximately 20,000 square feet of open land.

Mr. Black asked if this would be a drive-in type of operation and was informed that it would not. All operations are inside, there will be no microphones or other outside equipment. They may have take-out, however.

Mr. Siebert asked if the ingress and egress would be off Holmes and was advised that it would be.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-153-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 914 N. Pine Street from "C" two family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-155-66

Mr. Leslie E. Decker, representing Small Brother Oil Company, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 5963 South Cedar Street from "F" commercial to "E-2" drive-in district. Mr. Decker advised that the present zoning needs changing because one set of pumps are proposed in the "J" Parking district. The second set of pumps will be set in back of the parking area. He presented plans. If they cannot install the first set of pumps it would create a hardship.

Mr. Black asked if they couldn't move their tanks back to fit behind the setback, and Mr. Decker replied that a further setback would make it almost impossible to see.

Mr. Reynolds remarked that if all places had a setback of the same width, then they could see this station. Mr. Decker advised that the station could be seen from the South, but from the North it cannot be seen very well.

Mrs. Bretz asked if they were the first property south of the highway, and was advised that there is another piece of property to the north.

Z-156-66

Mr. Glen Dean, Councilman, appeared in behalf of the petition by B. B., D. B. and H. Friedland to rezone a parcel at 1024 Center Street, from "H" light industrial to "I" heavy industrial district. Mr. Dean stated that the petitioners have a new hydraulic machine that takes cylinder blocks from cars and crushes them. There will not be any noise or distractions. An area 100 ft. x 100 ft. would be sufficient. Mr. Dean then mentioned that the petitioners own other property in the area.

Mr. Gaus asked if this request for rezoning covered all the property designated on the sketch and was advised that it did.

Mr. Black asked why the three houses on Center Street were being requested for heavy industrial, and Mr. Dean stated that the Staff of the Planning Department recommended that they include the whole block now.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-158-66

Mr. Fred Abood, Attorney, appeared for Mr. Vernell S. Meese in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 4819 S. Pennsylvania Avenue, from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district. Mr. Abood stated that due to the existing uses in the area, they feel this is a classical example of spot zoning. They applied in

1964 to have this rezoned for two family and it was denied. Recently a parcel to the south was rezoned for multiple dwelling. They have 91 feet on Pennsylvania and 132 feet deep for a total of 12,000 square feet. They would like to construct an 8 family structure. They feel this would be the highest and the best use.

Mrs. Bretz asked for a clarification of the area and Mr. Abood mentioned the usages there.

Mr. Reynolds asked if the petitioner owned Lot 28, and was advised that he did not.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-159-66

Mr. Stuart J. Dunning, Jr., Attorney, appeared for Mr. Alfred McCarroll, in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at the southwest corner of Butler and Lenawee Streets described as:

East 70 feet of Lot 1, Block 8, Bush, Butler and Sparrow's Addition, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "C" two family to "F" commercial district. Mr. Dunning reported that the petitioner is being displaced by the highway where for more than 15 years he owned commercial property. This property was purchased this spring and is vacant. It has been vacant for about 15 years. It appears that the present zoning is not the best use for the property. The petitioner plans for a grocery store on the premises. Plans were presented. The structure will be two stories high. There will be a parking area, and plans call for two apartments above the store. He mentioned the houses in the area. It was felt that the grocery will render a need to the community. The petitioner would like to keep in the same vicinity as where his former business was. They feel that the changing complexion of the neighborhood would warrant this rezoning.

Mr. Guernsey asked if this were a lot split inasmuch as only a portion of Lot 1 is requested for rezoning. He further asked Mr. Dunning if he were aware of some recent rezonings in this area.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-160-66

Mr. James R. Duncan, Broker, appeared for Daisy T. Angell, in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 5500 South Cedar St., from "A" one family residence to "C" two family district. Mr. Duncan stated that they feel that the use proposed will be compatible with the Master Plan.

Mr. Black asked if there were any way this property could be serviced inasmuch as there is no access apparent? Mr. Duncan advised there is an egress from Joshua and also off Cedar Street. There is an easement running off Armstrong. The roads are not constructed as yet, however, there is a right-of-way.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-161-66

Mrs. Darwin D. Worden, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 3826 S. Logan Street, from "A" one family residential to "F" commercial district. Mrs. Worden remarked that they have had a dry cleaning operation since 1954. They must have the commercial zoning to add on to the present building.

Mr. Reynolds asked if they owned the lot to the North, and was informed that they do except for the north 30 feet.

Mr. Siebert asked the size of the present building, and was informed that it is 34 ft. x 30 ft. The addition is to be 18 ft. x 34 ft. and will be to the north of the present building.

Mr. Black asked how long the heating contractor to the north had been there, and was advised that he has been there since about 1952.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-162-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 5200 South Logan Street, from "A" one family to "F-1" commercial district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-163-66

Mr. Edward F. Tank, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 1319 Massachusetts Street, from "B" one family to "C" two family. Mr. Tank advised that they feel they have room for an apartment house. This is a non-conforming area. Quite a few places have been converted. The house on the land has five bedrooms.

Mr. Reynolds asked the size of the lot and was informed that it is 49 feet x 132 feet.

Mr. Siebert asked how close he was to the building on Lot 182 and was informed there is a joint drive-way.

Mr. Black asked if the petitioner could pinpoint the homes that are now used as two family? Mr. Tank presented the Board his list on homes converted to other than one family use.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-164-66

Mr. Joe D. Pentecost, appeared for Marvin H. and Doris C. Moore, in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 4312 Collins Road, from "A" one family residential to "F" commercial district, and presented aerial photographs of the area. The property is presently used for a house and garage. A picture of the structures and a plot plan were presented. This is not speculative. The development of this would not bother any neighbor, nor create any problems. He presented a picture of the proposed office building. Ingress and egress will be from Collins Road. They will install septic tanks.

Mr. Guernsey asked if they would be willing to pay for sewers to serve the site, and was informed that they would.

Mr. Siebert mentioned the odd size of the land, and Mr. Pentecost explained that this was because of the State and County Road Commissions taking part for their use.

Mr. Guernsey asked if the office building would front on Dunckel and was advised that it would not.

Mr. Fink asked the square foot area for office use, and Mr. Pentecost presented a plan showing it to be 40 ft. x 84 ft. and of two stories in height. The size may be changed if so recommended by the architect, Manson, Jackson and Kane.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-165-66

Mr. C. Rowland Stebbins, Realtor, appeared for Charles E. Bovinette, in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 204 W. Grand River Avenue from "C" two family to "D" apartment district and reported that it had been listed on the real estate card as two family zoning. After the sale they were informed that it cannot be used for anything but one family. The new purchaser has completed some remodeling of the inside.

Miss Shirley M. Gagnon, Attorney, appeared and stated that the lot is small. The entire area is commercial and multiple. There is too much traffic and danger. There are no children in the area. Unless it is rezoned the owners remodeling for three apartments will be useless and he might

lose a large investment. There is parking space for three cars.

Mr. Black asked for a clarification on the zoning and use.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-166-66

Mr. John Eliasohn, appeared for Mr. Audley A. (Buster) Schnepf, in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 4312 S. Cedar Street and 412 E. Cavanaugh Road described as:

East 148 feet, excepting S. 50 feet of Lot 15, Supervisor's Plat No. 2, Lansing, Township, now City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan West 12 feet of West 49 feet of Lot 18, Supervisor's Plat No. 2, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan,

Lot 19 of Supervisor's Plat No. 2, Lansing Township, now City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one family to "J" parking and "F" commercial district. Mr. Eliasohn reported that the petitioner had recently received a letter from the Building Inspector that the parking area is not in conformance with the ordinance. The petitioner has been in the grocery business for 20 years. Parking to the rear has been used about the same length of time. A driveway opening to Cavanaugh is used as egress. They are asking to have 12 ft. rezoned for "J" parking. They will blacktop the "J" parking area.

Mr. Reynolds asked if the alley off Cavanaugh would be used to get to the parking lot and was advised that it would. The State has put up some sort of barricade to eliminate the use of Cedar Street.

Mr. Siebert asked if the alley could be widened. Mr. Eliasohn stated that they now have three openings on the back.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-167-66

Mr. Edgar L. Church, Attorney, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 2800 block North Grand River Avenue described as:

Commencing on the southerly line of the 100 ft. right-of-way of Grand River Avenue at a point south 68 degrees, 26 minutes east 10.13 feet from the intersection of said right-of-way and the north and south $\frac{1}{4}$ line, thence south 68 degrees 26 minutes east 270 feet, thence south 21 degrees 34 minutes

west 397.6 feet to the north bank of the Grand River, thence north 45 degrees 37 minutes west 292.9 feet along said bank, thence north 21 degrees 34 minutes east 284 feet to the point of beginning in Section 5, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, ALSO

Commencing on the southerly line of the 100 foot right-of-way of Grand River Avenue at a point south 68 degrees 26 minutes east 280.13 from the intersection of said right-of-way and the north and south $\frac{1}{4}$ line thence south 21 degrees 34 minutes west 170 feet thence 68 degrees 26 minutes east 167 feet thence north 21 degrees 34 minutes east 169.45 feet thence northwesterly 167 feet on an arc to left whose chord bears north 68 degrees 15 minutes west 167 feet to the point of beginning in Section 5, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one family residential to "D-1" professional offices district.

Mr. Church advised that they have an option from Mrs. Mildred N. Beale on the West 270 feet of the property. This is to be used for their own office. They need more parking than they have at their present location, so they would like to construct their own office building. They have no architectural plans at present. The building may be large enough to rent to others for office use.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Mr. C. Rowland Stebbins asked that consideration be given to three items, namely; furnishing the River Improvement Committee with suggestions, a setback on river banks similar to that used for property and the possibility of a meeting of the previous members of the Planning Board to enlighten them on current undertakings.

Recess from 9:15 to 9:50 P.M.

BUSINESS SESSION

Motion by Fink, seconded by Gaus and Siebert, that the minutes of September 6th be approved.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

S-14-66

Preliminary Hearing on the subdivision of Delray Manor submitted by Noel Maxam was set for October 18, 1966, in Court Room No. 1, 6th Floor of City Hall at 7:30 P.M.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-188-65

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Black, that the Board recommend to City Council that the Community Unit Plan by W. Richard Neller for a parcel at 6326 South Cedar Street be approved and recommends the Community Unit Plan as follows:

The general concept and plan for the Major Streets be essentially as shown on the revised plan dated 9-10-66.

Parcel A

1. That the general street pattern and lot arrangement of parcel A, to consist of at least 43 acres, with approximately 132 single family lots, with an overall average lot size of 75 feet by 120 feet, be developed as shown on the plan. (This includes a street connection to Miller Road as shown on the plan).

Parcel B

2. That the retail shopping center, be developed as a community center of 23 acres with a maximum gross floor area of 185,700 square feet, and a ratio of three (3) square feet of parking area to one (1) square foot of gross floor area plus landscaping.

Parcel C

3. That the lot and plan arrangement consisting of 17 acres to be developed for offices and professional buildings, be developed as shown on the plan.

Parcel D

4. That the use and general plan arrangement for garden apartments and town houses, with a density of not more than twelve (12) units per acre, be developed as shown on the plan.

Parcel E

5. That the use and general plan arrangement consisting of 7½ acres for a park site be developed as shown on the plan subject to the approval and acceptance of the site by the Parks and Recreation Board.

Parcel F

6. That the use and general plan arrangement of the 12 acre school site be developed in accordance with the requirements of the Lansing Board of Education. That the traffic on Gardenia Street to the boulevard as proposed on the revised plan dated September 19, 1966 be terminated with a cul-de-sac as proposed by the Lansing Board of Education (Sketch K-1 9-19-66) and agreed to by the Walter Neller Company and St. Michael's Church.

Parcel G

7. That the use and general plan arrangement of the 4½ acre church site be developed as shown on the plan and that access to the site be acceptable to the church.

8. That a preliminary plat for the entire area be submitted with a final platting to be determined in accordance with the actual land development.

9. Subsequent development plans be submitted to the City for approval.

Parcel A, C and D land uses could be increased to include the excess property, that is not recommended for the commercial development.

This recommendation was by 6 yeas and 1 nay vote.

In the development of its analysis and recommendation the Planning Board examined detailed analysis of Larry Smith and Associates, Gladstone and Associates, economic consultants; and Villican Leman Associates, planning consultants; and other services within business, land development, and planning fields.

These recommendations are therefore based on official policies, and consistent with Lansing's Master Plan.

1. That property adjacent to the area included in the plan will not be adversely affected.

A. The land use within the plan is so arranged that it provides for a proper and compatible transition with the adjacent residential development.

B. The Planning Board has commended the Walter Neller Company for their full cooperation in the site development and the utilization of Johnson, Johnson, and Roy site planners.

2. That the plan is consistent with the intent and purpose of Chapter 36-7 of the Lansing Zoning Code to promote public health, safety, morals, and general welfare.

The land use and land use regulations within the project, and their affect on the adjacent properties are in keeping with the general intent of the Zoning Code.

3. That the buildings shall be used only for single family dwellings, two family dwellings or multiple dwelling and the usual accessory uses such as garages, storage space, and community activities including churches, and accessory commercial purposes.

A. The Plan as approved indicates the uses proposed for this development, these uses are in keeping with Section 36-7 of the Zoning Code.

B. The residential development, church and school park site, professional offices district, and community shopping center are all an integral part of this planned community.

The Planning Board's recommendation on the Kahres Community Unit Plan recognizes that there are several problems of property ownership yet to be resolved, before the plan can become a reality.

1. It is understood that the Neller Company and St. Michael's Church are negotiating for an exchange of sites. In the belief that community welfare would be best served by the comprehensive development proposed by Neller Company it has been recommended by the Planning Board that the St. Michael's zoning petition be denied. (Z-103-66)
2. Eifert Road has yet to be vacated.
3. The Board of Education owns property indicated on the plan as residential. The proposed relocation as yet has not been confirmed by the School Board.
4. The location, extent, and acquisition of property adjacent to the school for Park purposes has yet to be recommended by the Parks Department and approved by Lansing City Council.

In items 1, 3 and 4 mentioned, there has been a constant negotiation during the processing of the Plan. Indications are at this point that amicable agreement can be reached. Approval of the Plan by Council would indicate their intent to vacate Eifert Road as it now exists.

The Planning Board and the Staff in cooperation with the Neller Company and other agencies have made a number of improvements in the Plan since it was first submitted. The changes adopted have moved toward a better Plan. The Planning function is desirous of, and pledges continued support to aid in the success of this project.

Mr. Manz stated that so far all recommendations of the Board had been carried out by the petitioner, and the cutting of the commercial area in half, he could not go along with.

Mr. Black said I would like to debate Brother Manz as long as the subject has been brought up. It seems to me that here we are faced with one of the most serious decisions in City Planning that the Board has had to make in a long, long time.

Twelve years ago the City was faced with a similar serious decision as to whether the City Hall should be located downtown or out some where. The community and the Planning Board and Council were divided right down the middle. As a matter of fact, it took Mayor Crego's vote to break a tie in the Council and to keep the City Hall down town. I remember that in

giving the reason for his vote he stated that the Lansing downtown area needed revitalizing and that we couldn't expect private developers to do anything if the City itself gave up the ghost and moved out. I think that if we look back over the 12 years that have elapsed since that time it is apparent that this decision on the part of the City sparked the entire re-development of Capitol Avenue and other new buildings and remodeling projects in the central business district. Combined with that, the State has decided to keep the center of State government downtown and the Community College is committed to a central location. The only thing we need at this point to make downtown really sing is another major department store.

The City has recognized this through the Urban Renewal Board's program, approved by the Council. Proposals have been submitted and accepted by the Council for the development of the 100 Block of North Washington (Urban Renewal Project No. 1) which provides for a major department store. The developers have approximately a year and a half to produce under the terms of their agreement with the City. I think the City has a primary obligation to protect and co-operate with them during that period.

I have heard it said that we can't, by zoning, force a store to locate downtown because they will go wherever conditions are most favorable for them and, at the present time, downtown is not the most favorable location. I agree with that basic premise, as far as the present situation is concerned, but at the same time I think in the overall interest of the City, conditions downtown have got to be made attractive enough to cause a major department store to prefer that location.

There are two things needed to make it attractive; 1. people, and 2. parking. There are a lot of people already downtown in offices, in the Capitol development, in the Community College, in other downtown stores and in apartments under construction, who are potential customers for a new department store. The number of such people will increase materially as these developments are completed. This potential does not exist at the Kahres location or at any of the other suburban locations to which customers must specifically drive in order to shop. There is, therefore, essentially a large captive group of customers in the downtown area to begin with, which is an advantage that no other location can offer.

The advantage we don't have is parking, and I think the Urban Renewal Board and the Council and this Planning Board too, ought to re-think what the Parking Program should be in the Central Business District. For example, I did a little figuring since we talked about this some time ago. A department store with 150,000 to 200,000 square feet of space, at the ratio of 3 square feet of parking to one square foot of store area, and at 350 square feet

per car, would require about 1,750 parking spaces. The office building which is proposed on the No. 100 Block, if it is the size of the Stoddard Building, would need another 500 places, and the motel which is proposed on this block should have another 300. This totals about 2,550 parking spaces needed to properly serve the development which the City has already accepted under Urban Renewal Project No. 1. The only thing proposed so far to satisfy that 2,550 places, is a parking deck on the second block of North Grand Avenue, which would have a capacity of 1,000 to 1,200 cars. That obviously has got to be at least doubled if we want to get a department store downtown. This parking is a very serious thing. To help you visualize how much space 2,550 cars would require you would have to cover the whole second block of North Washington Avenue with a deck 8 stories high in order to park that many cars.

So I think the whole program should be re-thought, and that if necessary the City should somehow find a way to subsidize downtown parking to such an extent that it would attract a major department store. It will cost a certain amount of money to provide parking in any outlying location, maybe \$300.00 or \$400.00 per car. The ramps downtown will cost \$2,000.00 to \$2,300.00 per car, leaving a difference of between \$1,600.00 and \$1,900.00 dollars per car that has to be financed somehow. I think the City should subsidize that in some form. How I don't know, but my personal opinion is that the City can't afford to back away from this program and that we should not authorize any suburban commercial development which is big enough to stymie the downtown project. I therefore think Zoning Committee is on the right track, and that their recommendation regarding the Kahres project ought to be approved.

Mr. Reynolds stated that he thought we were being a little bit on the short side, but being in the Renewal Board, he was more or less committed to accept the Urban Renewal Project. His own personal feeling on this was the fact that we are being a little bit short on this, a little bit more would give them something to do with. A community shopping center is not quite what we are after, something a little bigger, but not as big as a regional, and the Zoning Committee has made a recommendation and he would go along with the recommendation.

Mr. Manz stated that he thought that if we pass this with the retail shopping center down to this area, we are going to just delight a couple of people who are planning shopping centers outside the City of Lansing and I don't think any of us want to see that.

Mr. Black then added that he agreed with Mr. Manz, unless we do something different with the down town program. We have got to face up to the fact that we got to provide parking, and I think we ought to do everything possible to make it

more desirable for the public to come downtown than to locate outside the city.

Some discussion followed in regard to having Mr. Black's comments added to the recommendation, and Mr. Fink made the motion. There was no second. Further discussion was held noting that this would become a part of the minutes.

Mr. Reynolds stated that he believed the Urban Renewal Board would like a copy of the minutes.

Mr. Gaus then asked if all the property in the Kahres Farm was considered by the Committee and Staff recommendation, and was advised that the recommendation considered by the Committee and Staff recommendation, and was advised that the recommendation considered all the property in the plan submitted on September 19, 1966.

Further discussion was held.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: Manz—1.

Z-103-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Fink, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Clark B. Ackley, Architect, for St. Michael's Episcopal Church to rezone a parcel at 2709 Eifert Road from "A" one family to "B" one family district be denied.

In view of the recent revisions on the Kahres Farm property Z-188-65, and the Committee recommendation pertaining to this case, the Board recommends that this request be denied.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-118-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Reynolds, that the Board recommend to City Council that the Community Unit Plan by Roy D. Murphey for a parcel in the 600 Block Northrup Street described as:

Com. at S. $\frac{1}{8}$ Post of N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 4 the N. on $\frac{1}{2}$ line 660 ft. W. 616 ft. to County Drain centerline S'y along said centerline to E. and W. $\frac{1}{4}$ line, E. 718 ft. to beg. Exc. Com. on E. and W. $\frac{1}{4}$ line 644.8 ft. E. of W. $\frac{1}{4}$ post Sec. 4 the N. 206 ft. E. 152.2 ft. S. 206 ft. W. 152.2 ft. to Beg. Sec. 4, T3N, R2W,

Com. on N. and S. $\frac{1}{4}$ line of N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ 825 ft. N. of E. and W. $\frac{1}{4}$ line, N. on said $\frac{1}{4}$ line 222 ft. W'y 760 ft. to centerline County Drain 565 ft. E. of W. Sec. Line S. par'l to W. Sec. Line 223 ft. E. 760 ft. to beg. Sec. 4, T3N, R2W

be disapproved.

A detailed analysis of the proposed community unit plan resulted in the following determinations:

That the development would significantly increase traffic on Northrup Street.

That the plan would adversely affect the development of a single family residential plat to the north and a proposed plat to the east.

That the development of vacant land adjacent to the site would be impeded.

There was an apparent need for better coordination and follow through of development programs by the petitioner.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-128-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Fink, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Gross Telecasting Inc., owners Harold and Charlotte Gross, to rezone a parcel in the 2800 Block of East Saginaw Street described as:

Com. at int'n S. line E. Saginaw St. and N. and S. $\frac{1}{4}$ line Section 14, thence E'y along S. line E. Saginaw St. 375 ft. S. par'l to N. and S. $\frac{1}{4}$ line 480 ft. W'y 375 ft. plus/minus point in N. and S. $\frac{1}{4}$ line 480 ft. S. of beg. N. to beg., Sec. 14, T4N, R2W

and

Com. 375 ft. S. 89° 37' E. and 520 ft. 50° 18' W. of N. $\frac{1}{4}$ post Section 14, thence N. par'l to N. and S. $\frac{1}{4}$ line 480 ft. to S. line E. Saginaw St. E'y 172.64 feet along S. line E. Saginaw St. to W. line Howard St. S'y along W. line Howard St. 700 ft. N. 89° 54' 30" W. 549.80 ft. plus/minus to N. and S. $\frac{1}{4}$ line Section 14, N'y along $\frac{1}{4}$ line to point 520 ft. S. of N. $\frac{1}{4}$ post Section 14, E'y 375 ft. to beg.; Section 14, T4N, R2W

from "A" one family residential to "F" commercial district be denied as filed and that

The South 40 ft. and the west 40 ft. of the following described property:

Com. 375 ft. S. 89° 37' E. and 520 ft. 50° 18' W. of N. $\frac{1}{4}$ post Section 14, thence N. par'l to N. and S. $\frac{1}{4}$ line 480 ft. to S. line E. Saginaw St. E'y 172.64 ft. along S. line E. Saginaw St. to W. line Howard St. S'y along W. line Howard St. 700 ft. N. 89° 54' 30" W. 549.80 ft. plus/minus to N. and S. $\frac{1}{4}$ line Section 14, N'y along $\frac{1}{4}$ line to point 520 ft. S. of N. $\frac{1}{4}$ post Section 14 E'y 375 ft. to beg.; Section 14, T4N, R2W

be rezoned from "A" one family to "J" parking and

The balance of the entire property

be rezoned from "A" one family to "F" commercial district.

Screening to be provided along the west and south lines of the "J" parking district except for the residential setback on Howard Street. Screening to consist of one of the following:

A 5 ft. high dense privet hedge.

A 3 ft. high chain link fence with dense evergreen plantings of a mature height of 5 ft. to 5 ft. 6 in.

Or any other type of screening that may be suggested by the developer with the approval of the Planning Department.

Mr. Black asked if the attorney had been contacted about this recommendation, and was advised that he had, and he was in favor of the recommendation.

Mr. Gaus asked about the parking, and was advised it would be angle parking.

Mr. Fink questioned whether the recommendation had adequate buffering for the area?

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-134-66

Motion by Fink, seconded by Gaus, that the petition by Harold M. Davis to rezone property at 122 W. Miller Road from "A" one family residential to Community Unit Plan be tabled until October 18th following receipt of a letter from another realtor.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-135-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Fink, that the petition by Thomas G. Sinas, Trustee for the Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox Church of Lansing, to rezone property in

the 700 Block of E. Saginaw Street described as:

Commencing on North line of East Saginaw Street 350 feet East of East line of Marshall Street, thence North parallel to Marshall Street to a point 450 feet South of South line of East Grand River Avenue thence East parallel to East Grand River Avenue to a point 99.6 feet West of East line of Section 10, thence South parallel to E. line of Section 10, to N. line of East Saginaw Street, thence West to point of beginning, Section 10, T4N, R2W

from "B" one family to "D-1" professional office district be tabled until October 18th.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-137-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Manz, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Bryon D. Babcock to rezone a parcel at 3523 N. East Street from "A" one family to "G-2" wholesale district be granted.

The Board further suggests that the required front yard along North East Street be maintained in open green space except at ingress and egress points.

The site is located within the established commercial area of North East Street.

The change of zoning would encourage the use of the property which otherwise may remain vacant and neglected.

The existing land use relationship in this area makes it unreasonable to assume that the property would develop in accord with the existing zoning.

Mr. Fink mentioned that the recommendation did not specify the set back or green area, and was advised that this is 20 feet as per the present ordinance.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-138-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Fink, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Eleanor Anderson to rezone a parcel at 908 E. Kalamazoo from "C" two family to "F" commercial district be denied.

The proposed use was for the Mercy Ambulance Service. This service has since located at another site, and no longer has an interest in this property.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-139-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Fink, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Clyde J. Olin, Agent for Parks and Church, to rezone a parcel in the 6000 Block of Pheasant described as:

That part of Lot No. 23, Bliesener Subdivision, a part of the S. $\frac{1}{2}$ of the S.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the S.E. $\frac{1}{2}$ of Section 6, T3N, R2W, Delhi Township, Ingham County, Michigan described as follows:

Commencing at the N.W. corner of said Lot No. 23, thence south 90 ft. along the west side of Pheasant Avenue thence easterly to the most westerly corner of Lot No. 13, thence N. 44 degrees 30 sec. E. 125 ft. to the N.E. corner of said Lot No. 23 thence westerly 182.2 ft. on the north line of said Lot No. 23 to the point of beginning

from "A" one family to "G-2" wholesale district be denied.

A large portion of Logan Street in the vicinity should be treated as a unit as regards to development. Access roads parallel with Logan should be planned on a comprehensive basis and development as it occurs could then be encouraged to comply with the required setbacks. All development should be predicated on utility extensions to the area.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as residential.

This change would allow commercial traffic on a residential street.

The proposal would lead to undesirable mixed commercial and residential development in this area, which could deter the improvement and development of properties in accord with the existing zoning.

The area is being studied with respect to the Pleasant Grove Road extension, and this development could have an adverse effect on that proposal.

Utilities are not available to serve this area and are not expected for approximately five years.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-140-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Manz, that the Board recommend to City Council that the request for withdrawal of the petition by Wilbert Middleton to rezone a parcel at 611 S. Butler Blvd. from "A" one family residence to "F" commercial district be accepted and that the property remain in its present classification.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-141-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Black, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Gary L. Saelouis to rezone a parcel East of 1826 Dell Road described as:

Lot 1 of Hartland Subdivision, a Replat of part of Lot 19 and part of Lot 18 and part of Outlot "A" of Maple Grove Subdivision, a part of the E. ½ of S.E. ¼ of Section 10, T3N, R2W, Delhi Township, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one family residential to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied.

The density allowed in the "D-M" zone is completely out of character with the existing land use in the area.

This rezoning would establish a precedent for the area which could lead to further requests of a similar nature.

The absence of utilities in the area prohibits any kind of intense development at this time.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-143-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Manz, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by James A. Anderton, President of Simon Iron and Steel Corporation, to rezone a parcel at 1406 Sunset Avenue from "A" one residential to "J" parking district be granted.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as industrial.

The property is completely surrounded by industrial zoned land.

The "J" parking district as requested will provide for additional off-street parking for the Iron and Steel company located to the east.

The site meets the criteria for this type of zoning and use as indicated in the Master Land Use Plan.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-144-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Fink, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Melvin R. Barnes to rezone a parcel at 6615 S. Pennsylvania Avenue from "A" one family to "G-2" wholesale district be granted.

The change would not be contrary to the established zoning pattern.

The basic land use conditions have been changing in the area.

The changing land use in the area, and the exposure to a major street intersection gives substantial reasons why the property cannot be developed in accord with the existing zoning.

Any further division of land regarding this parcel will require platting.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-145-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Black, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Chester Johnson for Clyde J. Olin, Agent for H. C. Berger to rezone a parcel a 3717 S. Pennsylvania Avenue from "D-M" multiple dwelling to "G-2" wholesale district be denied.

On October 1, 1959, the Planning Board recommend that the property be zoned "D-M" multiple. The reasoning at this time was "D-M" multiple zoning would allow development in a residential nature that would provide a proper transition, between the single family to the south and the commercial area to the north.

The City Council concurred in this recommendation November 16, 1959.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as residential.

The change of zoning would allow commercial development adjacent to existing single family development.

The "D-M" multiple district provides a proper transition between the existing single family development to the south, and the commercial area to the north.

The change would adversely affect property values in the adjacent residential areas.

The change would adversely affect living conditions in the immediate area, principally through the increase of traffic and activity.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None

Z-146-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Leo J. and Mark K. Landis to rezone a parcel at 4501 S. Pennsylvania Avenue from "A" one family to "C-2" family district be denied.

The change would be contrary to established land use which is predominately single family.

The change would create a spot zone.

Development of the area has not been contrary to the existing regulations.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be used under the existing regulations. This block is exclusively one family homes.

The existing structure appears to violate the front yard requirements on Samantha Avenue.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-147-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Reynolds, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Leonard R. Farber to rezone a parcel at the N. E. Corner of Miller and Waverly Roads described as:

Beginning at a point at the S.W. corner of Section 6, 3, R2W, Delhi Township, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, thence North 655.0 ft. along the west line of said section to a point; thence East 370.0 feet to a

point; thence S. 51° 08' 24" E. 475.15 feet to a point; thence South 360.0 feet to a point on the Southerly line of said section; thence N. 89° 45' 30" W. 740.0 feet along the southerly line of said section to the point of beginning, containing 9.84 acres more or less including public right-of-way on Waverly Road and Miller Road.

from "A" one family to "F" commercial district be granted, subject to the following:

The necessary utilities being available.

Approval of final plat.

Acceptance or denial of future commercial requests within a one mile radius of this site should be carefully considered.

A plan of community structures attempts to project an organized system of self-contained residential section bounded or separated from one another by various physical barriers such as rivers, industrial or commercial areas, railways or existing and future trafficways.

The community structure is further divided into sub-communities and neighborhoods.

The request and proposed development under consideration at this time is closely related to a neighborhood unit, as described in the Master Plan.

The Board believes that the request is in keeping with the Master Land Use Plan, providing future requests of this nature, within the service area for this type of commercial development are controlled. Utility service is not available to serve this area at the present time.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-148-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Reynolds that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Leonard R. Farber to rezone a parcel at the N. E. Corner of Miller and Waverly Roads described as:

Land in section 6, T3N, R2W, Delhi Township, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan described as follows: Beginning at a point located North 655.0 feet from the S.W. corner of said section and the westerly line of said section, being the center line of Waverly Road, thence continuing North along the westerly line of said Section 328.2 feet; thence S. 89° 51' 30" E. 465.0 feet to a point; thence S. 55° 43' 33" E 900 feet to a point; thence S. 25° 46'

20° E. 115.0 feet to a point; thence S. 00° 12' 30" W. 375.0 ft. to a point on the Southerly line of said section being the center line of Miller Road; thence North 89° 45' 30" W. 516.0 feet to a point; thence North 360.0 feet to a point; thence N. 51° 08' 24" W. 475.15 feet to a point; thence West 370.0 feet to the point of beginning containing 13 acres more or less including right-of-way on Miller Road and Waverly Road,

from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple district be granted, subject to the following:

The necessary utilities being available.

Approval of a final plat.

Acceptance or denial of future commercial requests within 1 mile radius of this site should be carefully considered.

A plan of community structures attempts to project an organized system of self contained residential section bounded or separated from one another by various physical barriers such as rivers, industrial or commercial areas, railways or existing and future trafficways.

The community structure is further divided into sub-communities and neighborhoods.

The request and proposed development under consideration at this time is closely related to a neighborhood unit, as described in the Master Plan.

The Board believes that the request is in keeping with the Master Land Use Plan, providing future requests of this nature, within the service area for this type of commercial development are controlled. Utility service is not available to serve this area at the present time.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-149-66

Motion by Fink, seconded by Siebert, that the petition by Ivan V. Bartha to rezone an irregular shaped piece of land abutting North of 820 N. Sycamore Street described as:

All that part of Lots 21 and 22 of Block No. 1, of "O. F. Barnes Subdivision on Block 27, Original Plat." City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan which lies Southeasterly of a line 45 feet Southeasterly of (measured at right angles) and parallel to a line described as: beginning at a point on the centerline of Chicago Avenue which is 20 feet North along said centerline

from its intersection with the centerline of Oakland Avenue; thence South 88 deg. 27' 32" East, parallel with the centerline of Oakland Avenue, a distance of 223.20 feet to the point of curvature of a 1145.92 foot radius curve to the left (chord bearing North 81 deg. 00' 35" East); thence Northeasterly along the arc of said curve 421.25 feet to the point of tangency of said curve; thence North 70 degrees, 28' 43" East a distance of 278.61 feet to the point of curvature of a 1145.92 foot radius curve to the right (chord bearing North 81 deg. 02' 35" East); thence East along the arc of said curve 422.58 feet to the point of tangency of said curve and a point of ending.

from "C" two family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be tabled for a plat plan.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-150-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Black, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by John Eliasohn to rezone a parcel at 2325 S. Cedar Street from "D-M" multiple dwelling to "D-1" professional offices district be denied as filed and that

Lot 21 of Deeg's Subdivision

be rezoned to "D-1" professional offices and

Lot 22 of Deeg's Subdivision

be rezoned to "J" parking with screening along the east line of Lot 22.

Screening to consist of one of the following:

A dense privet hedge of a height of 5 ft.

A 3 ft. high chain link fence with dense evergreen plantings of a mature height of 5 ft. to 5 ft. 6 in.

A 5 ft. high chain link fence with interwoven slats.

Any other screening as may be suggested by the petitioner with approval of the Planning Board.

The property fronts on South Cedar Street, a heavily traveled major street.

The change would be consistent with the established land use along Cedar Street.

The change would allow physical improvement of the site by allowing removal of a dilapidated garage.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-151-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Black, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Gordon Elleff to rezone a parcel at 641 E. Jolly Road from "A" one residential to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied, and that the property owners be encouraged to work with the Planning Board to develop an overall plan for the area.

The change would create an isolated district unrelated to similar districts, i.e., this would be a "spot-zone."

There are several lots in the area that would have to be given the same consideration.

Development of this property would not allow for orderly development of the adjacent parcels.

If this zoning were allowed there would be little justification for any kind of orderly development in the adjacent areas.

Mr. Fink asked if the petitioner owned other land in the area, and was advised that the Board made the same recommendation one year ago and there has been some effort to plat the land.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

STREETS COMMITTEE

S-9-66 Capitol-Grand Bridge

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that City Council indicate to the State Highway Department their intentions as to the proposed malling of Washington Avenue. With the indications of mall approval, City Council could open talks with the State Highway Department for a revision of the engineering drawings of the Capitol and Grand Avenue Bridges.

A previous discussion with representatives of the State Highway Department indicated that they would be amenable to opening conversations with the Bureau of Public Roads as to the feasibility of this plan, providing the City Council indicates that the North-South traffic on South Washington Avenue, north of Main Street is to be eliminated by the malling of Washington Avenue with Capitol and Grand Avenues remaining a one-way pair.

Washington Avenue from Saginaw Street on the North and South to Kalamazoo St. will soon be closed to vehicular traffic. The northern part of Washington Avenue, south of Saginaw, will be utilized as a pedestrian

mall through the Community College campus and Urban Renewal Project No. 1. South of Michigan to Kalamazoo Street the development of the parking mall will soon take place. It is anticipated that in the future, the extension of this pedestrian mall should encompass the area south of Michigan to approximately Hillsdale Street. This would provide for the expansion of general business uses as related to the core or central business district function.

Mr. Black discussed the meeting he had with the City Council and the State Highway Department. He reported the reluctance of the Highway people to request a change of plans from the Federal Government until the City would certify as to the future mall.

Some discussion on the area of the mall was held.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

S-2-65P Prawdzik Subdivision

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz, that the developer be notified that the Preliminary Plat of Prawdzik Subdivision was disapproved until such time as the owners of the abutting vacant lands submit a comprehensive plan for the area.

Discussion was held on the pros and cons of denying this plat, and it was the general consensus that by denying it at this time, perhaps the property owners or another developer could make arrangements to plat the whole area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: Fink—1.

S-8-66F S. Penn. Concourse

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the Board advise City Council that they approved the Final Plat of South Penn. Concourse, and recommend that it be approved by City Council subject to the following conditions:

All public improvements shall be installed with complete public utilities including water, sanitary sewer, storm sewers, and full street improvements including street paving, curb and gutter, sidewalks, and such other improvements as required under Section VI D of the Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

The posting of financial security in the amount of:

| | |
|---------------------------------|------------|
| Storm and Sanitary Sewers | \$8,500.00 |
| Monument Deposit | 100.00 |
| Total | \$8,600.00 |

prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

All other standards and requirements of the Michigan State Plan Act, Act 172, Public Acts of 1929, as amended, shall apply.

No ingress or egress shall be allowed the south boundary of the plat, i.e. Pierpont Street. If an additional 14 ft. of right-of-way for Pierpont Street be dedicated then access may be provided.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. Guernsey advised that the Staff are working with the Mayor's Technical Coordinating Committee on the forthcoming Capital Improvements Program. They will be working the next three weeks so that the Program will be out by January 1st.

FINANCE

Motion by Fink, seconded by Siebert, that \$3,500 be transferred from the full time salaries account to the part time salaries account for employment of part time personnel.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Manz, that \$300.00 be transferred from the Surplus Cash Account to the conference account to provide funds for the Michigan Society of Planning Officials Conference in Petoskey, Michigan.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

NEW BUSINESS

Misc 3-65

Mr. Gaus was appointed Chairman to meet with the other Boards on the McCourt School and street recommendation.

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz, that gavels be awarded to all previous Board members, and that they be issued to all future members. Some discussion was held on differentiating the type of gavels to former Chairman from the rest.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

ROW-22-66 SCOTT PARK DRIVE

A letter addressed to the City Planning Board had been received from Mr. R. T. Rollis, General Manufacturing Manager of Oldsmobile Division, of General Motors Corporation relative to the Board's decision of September 21st on the drive.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

Mr. Edwin P. Brown, Assistant Director, advised that he had received a telephone call from Mr. William Forgraves, developer of the industrial Park, inviting the Board to a tour of the industrial Center preferably before October 12th. Mr. Forgraves was leaving the City about the 12th for a period of approximately two weeks.

After some discussion the Board asked that Mr. Forgraves be advised that they preferred to tour the Center after his return.

Z-84-66

This petition by Francis N. Fine, recently recommended negatively by the Board, has been referred back to the Planning Board. The developer had obtained additional property and is therefore altering his request.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Meeting was adjourned at 11:35 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

T/C

ft. of Lot 6, all in Block 20, Original Plat, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan.

Therefore, be it resolved, that the property above described is hereby changed from "H" Light Industrial District to "I" Heavy Industrial District as set forth in the Zoning Code of said city, and

Be it further resolved, that the Zoning Maps be amended to indicate such transfer.

Adopted by the following vote:

Unanimously.

By Councilman Bradshaw—

That the Dept. of Public Service check the sewer being put in south of Riversedge Subd. as to the open ditch left by the contractor at night.

Carried.

By Councilman Bradshaw—

That the City Assessor report as to the present proceeding for assessment on

Off-Street parking lots in the outlying areas and report to the council.

Carried.

By Councilman Dean—

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Lansing:

That the attached claims be allowed and the City Clerk be and she is hereby authorized to draw orders on the City Treasurer for the amount allowed each claimant, in the amount of \$141,696.80.

Adopted by the following vote:

Unanimously.

Council adjourned at 9:15 P M.

THEO FULTON,
City Clerk.

Lansing Michigan

November 28, 1966

F/B

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Special Meeting, October 6, 1966

A joint meeting with the City Council.

Z-221-65

Mr. Raymond C. Guernsey gave an explanation of the Zoning Process on a Community Unit.

Question slips were passed out to the audience.

Mr. Guernsey then explained the location of the proposed plan, the present uses in the area.

Mr. Joseph O'Leary, explained that the St. Vincent dePaul Society is a non-profit charitable organization. He explained how they became interested in this type of venture. Plans call for this to be built on the 221 d3 plan under FHA mortgage. The sole purpose is to provide housing where there is a need.

Mr. Anas stated that according to his information, this was to be moderate income housing, of which 10% maximum is to be low income rental. Does this mean then that only 10% is to be subsidized rental? Mr. Anas was informed that is correct. Then he asked, the other moderate rental is to be borne wholly by the tenant, and was advised that was correct. Mr. O'Leary added that this is part of the ruling of the FHA.

Recess.

Mr. Townsend asked the acreage, the number of families per acre, and the plan for fencing, and what completely contained meant.

Some discussion followed on the past policy of the Planning Board and the City Council.

Mr. Townsend, asked about the alley ROW and if fencing would be on both sides of the alley. He stated he would like to have this separated from the play areas and the housing. He inquired who would pay for this.

He further questioned how one could qualify to live in the unit.

Mr. Koepke asked are these units one story or two story? He was advised that they will be using the same basic idea as to Smokier Town House.

Mr. DeVinney, asked what type of construction, and was advised that it would be brick and aluminum siding.

Mr. Phil Besse, asked the size of the playground area.

Mr. Gaus, asked how the density compared with the townhouses, and was advised this would be about 9.3 units per acre, the townhouses are about 12. This would be a little more than twice the density of the single family homes.

Some discussion was held on the number of people who might be living within this project.

Mr. Rusk, asked about the retaining wall, and questioned whether the chain link or brick wall would be the best.

Mr. Grinnell, asked about where the children would attend school, and was informed of the schools in the area for the different age levels. It was also mentioned that this plan had been referred to the Board of Education. Some further discussion was held on the possibility of additional school facilities in the area.

Mr. Grinnell, asked how the property was going to be policed or properly maintained. The streets will be open and will be patrolled by the Police Department. The units will be handled by a managing agency who will maintain the grounds.

Mr. Young, asked about grading, and was advised that the surface draining must be handled within the project.

Mr. Springer, asked how far the project would be from the existing borders.

Mr. Townsend, asked how close the project would be to his property line.

Mr. Gaus, asked the setback for the rear of this property, and was advised that none of the units will be built closer than 30 feet to the line.

Mr. DeVinney asked the approximate rental rate, Mr. O'Leary advised that the rental will be determined by the cost of the buildings and the maintenance costs.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLUMBING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, October 13, 1966

Meeting was called to order by Vice Chairman, Ralph Gunthrope at 7:30 p.m.

Members present: Wm. Miles, Ralph Gunthrope, Larry Kain, John Brady and G. J. Turney—5.

Inspectors: Leo Fox—1.

Absent: George Wyllie, George Denfield, and Councilman, Glen Dean—3.

Minutes of the last meeting were approved as read.

Mr. Gunthrope mentioned that there should be a report on the status of the Code

that is in the Committee of the Council and a report for the November 10th meeting.

Leo Fox reported that the drain layers' licenses were issued to Richard Rumsey, Richard Randell, Homer Spencer, and Weldon Somers during the summer months. Drain layer's license was not granted to Harrison Holey after completing his written examination.

Motion by Mr. Gunthrope and supported by Larry Kain that Durwood Lee Mason and John Tallman after they completed their written examination the licenses not be issued.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, November 18, 1966

Meeting was called to order at 7:35 P.M.
by Chairman Ramona Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus,
Manz and Siebert—6.

Absent: Heino and Reynolds—2.

HEARINGS

Z-157-66

Community Unit Plan submitted by
Beneicke and Krue for property at 3535
Moore's River Drive.

Mr. Ronald Gierthy, Planner, gave a
graphic presentation of the area adjacent
to the plan to the audience.

Mr. Guernsey explained the principles of
the Community Unit Plan.

Mr. Arthur Elliott, realtor, presently an
associate with Beneicke and Krue, stated
that they are very excited about the plan.
Mr. Elliott discussed background of the de-
velopers and told about the existing units
developed by them. He mentioned the ex-
pected revenue from these units and that
the money would remain in the community.

Mr. Reynolds came in at 7:40 P.M.

Mr. Robert Krue advised that the state
trend is toward apartments and garden
houses. This site was acquired about 16
months ago. They have made a market
study and feel there is a definite need for
rental units. This will make for both
quality in location and quality in accom-
modation. They believe this site is near
perfect and propose to build garden type
and town houses. Their plans call for one,
two and three bedroom units renting from
\$150 to \$250 per month based on leases.
In selecting this site consideration was
given as to the proximity of this site to the
expressway. The entrances and exits on
Waverly will be no more than $\frac{1}{4}$ mile
from this site. This will allow easy access
to the downtown area and the industrial

areas in and around Lansing. Mr. Krue
then mentioned the brochures that had been
handed to the Board. He advised that these
units should produce approximately 26
children of school age. Based on their
figures this plan would give tax revenue
of approximately \$80,000 per year.

Mr. Dick Beneicke told of the steps taken
before their plans were made. These build-
ings will be of colonial style, two stories,
with an outdoor patio or balcony and full
basement. The areas will be landscaped
and the patio areas will be fenced for pri-
vacy with brick and wood. Ten will be of
the town house type. The garden apart-
ments will consist of 60 two bedroom, 16
three bedroom and 64 one bedroom. He
further mentioned the terrain and the
existing tree growth and that trees will
be saved as much as possible. On the
access from Moore's River Drive, the main
entrance will be a boulevard. They will
also provide private drives starting from
Lewton and ending at the Elks Club House.
They further plan on having a swimming
pool, convenience shops and twelve guest
rooms which will be intended primarily
for the occupants of the Community Unit
Plan. It will have a non-commercial ap-
pearance on Moore's River Drive. Parking
will be provided, with an overall count of
530 spaces which gives better than a two
to one per unit.

Beneicke and Krue have met with the
people to the south and explained their pro-
gram. The townhouses will abut single
family homes. They will also work with
the surrounding owners relative to grading
problems. They have met with the Elks
Club and discussed the grade problem and
the possibility of a joint drive. The other
uses in the area were mentioned.

Mr. Black asked if there would be full
basements under all units, and was ad-
vised that there would be, and each unit
would have their own heating and cooling
plant. Mr. Black then questioned the chim-
neys and was referred to the drawing on
display.

Mr. Reynolds asked about the conveni-
ence shops in the 6,000 to 7,000 square foot
and was advised that they will be possibly
cleaners, general store, perhaps one or two
professional offices, etc. mainly for the use
of the residents of the unit.

Mr. Charles Hopkins, Real Estate Broker, appeared and stated that for the last 13 years he had been associated with Beneicke and Krue and their relationship has been excellent. He stated he felt it was a very professional approach to giving the community a Community Unit Plan. He believes it is the proper use of the land.

Street Cross Sections

Mr. James A. Church, Planner, explained the street cross section revisions, discussed the widths and what categories would be used on different streets.

Mr. Black questioned if Moores River Drive were going to be a parkway, if it would effect the previous Community Unit Plan. Mr. Church explained the parkway would be from Mt. Hope south to the Grand River.

Mr. Fink asked about the classifications used by the state, and was informed that they use those listed in Public Act 51. Mr. Fink then asked if the state had standards for these roads and was advised they do for freeways, but not for the others.

Mr. Reynolds asked if the state would adopt this terminology, and was advised that two of their members are on the technical coordinating committee Tri County, also there are three county highway commissioners.

Mr. Manz stated that he thought this change would have to be acted upon by the legislature.

Mrs. Evelyn White, asked about the future of Cedar Street. She was advised that the state highway department asked that its trunkline classification be removed, however, the Master Plan has it listed as a major street. It is intended to have it remain as such. Mr. Church also mentioned the city's needs for secondary roads.

Mr. Manz then added that the plan calls for two trunk lines running through Lansing and he thought the state might not be in favor of this.

Central City Plan

Mr. Raymond C. Guernsey discussed the work of Vilcan-Leman and Associates and the Staff. The Central City Plan includes an area of one square mile. Charts were shown and discussion held on traffic land use in the area, retail sales, what is needed for the river, landscaping and aerial views. Mr. Guernsey explained that the downtown area costs have increased but the tax revenues have decreased since 1954. The area shows signs of blight. It is believed that the downtown area should be a retail comparison goods center. Right now the city is culturally deprived. Goals for downtown major land uses are: Office Centers, Educational and Cultural Centers, and Regional Shopping Center.

The audience were informed that the

formal hearing on the Central City Plan would be held November 15th.

A man from the audience asked what will happen to the residents who are now in the Central Business District inasmuch as 51% of these are elderly. Mr. Guernsey replied that some of the living quarters these people have are slums. The city's plans for development were explained.

Discussion on Housing needs followed.

The Capitol Development Area was then discussed.

Mr. A. F. Cummerfort, asked about the traffic flow. His main concern was coming to the downtown area from the Logan-Clare area. Mr. Guernsey explained routes available to him that would not be changed with the possible development of a mall.

Mrs. Martha Pratt asked if there would be any provisions for a walk across Capitol?

Mr. Black remarked, on the expansion of the state development, this may be delayed for a great length of time. Mr. Guernsey stated the state hopes to expand as soon as money is available. Mr. Black then suggested, that perhaps the state buy the land now and eliminate the problems of zoning for the next thirty years. The buildings could remain as is and be rented.

The Board were informed that Mr. Sam Obrecht had mailed a copy on article from the October issue of *Readers Digest* relative to malls.

Also received was a card from an interested citizen relative to Scott Park Drive, together with a letter from General Motors. Matter was received and filed.

Mr. Cummerfort, asked if the area west of Logan is being planned for rezoning to multiple dwelling. Mr. Guernsey, stated that there are no plans for this at the present time. Mr. Cummerfort, then asked about notification of persons within 300 feet on a rezoning, and was advised that this was not done, however on an appeal or on subdividing land people within 300 feet were notified. The Board has no power to grant a rezoning. The City Council does this.

Mr. Fink mentioned that Mr. Cummerfort might be interested in the hearings on the new Zoning Ordinance, and advised that this would be published in the State Journal.

Recess was from 9:30 to 9:53 P.M.

BUSINESS SESSION

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz, that the minutes of September 20th be approved.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Motion by Black, seconded by Fink, that the Board ask City Council to set a public hearing on the proposed Zoning Changes for Tuesday, November 22, 1966 at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Gaus, that the second Board meeting for the month of November be held on Tuesday, November 22, 1966, 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1, 6th Floor of City Hall.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-75-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Board recommend to City Council that after reconsidering the letter of August 10, 1966 and the petition by Sam S. Bofysil, as represented by Leo A. Farhat, referred back from City Council, to rezone a parcel in the 900 Block of Miller Road described as:

Lots 1, 2 and 3 of Southbrook Subdivision (formerly Delhi Township), City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one family district to "D-M" multiple dwelling district, that the Board's recommendation June 9, 1966, recommending the petition be denied as filed, and the property be zoned "C" two family district, should be upheld.

This would encourage development of the site and keep any proposed structures in harmony with the existing residential development. The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as low density residential (2 to 3 dwelling units per net acre). "D-M" multiple zoning would allow development out of character with the existing adjacent residential development.

The 100 foot easement across the Hilliard Drain provides a buffer and physically separates the potential commercial development and the residential uses.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-134-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Board recommend to City Council that the request for withdrawal of the petition by Harold M. Davis to rezone a parcel at 122 West Miller Road, from "A" one family to Community Unit Plan be accepted and that the property remain in its present classification.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-135-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Thomas G. Sinas, Trustee, for Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox Church, to rezone a parcel in the 700 Block E. Saginaw described as:

Parcel B—Commencing on North line of East Saginaw Street 350 feet East of East line of Marshall Street, thence North parallel to Marshall Street to a point 450 feet South of South line of East Grand River Avenue, thence East parallel to East Grand River Avenue to a point 99.6 feet West of East line of Section 10, thence South parallel to East line of Section 10 to North line of East Saginaw Street, thence West to point of beginning, Section 10, T4N, R2W

from "B" one family to "D-1" professional district be granted.

1. The property in the immediate area is being used for office type use.
2. The change would not be contrary to the established Land Use Pattern.
3. The basic land use conditions have changed in this area.
4. The changing land use conditions in this area has made it reasonable to assume that the property will not develop in single family residential.

The Board further reaffirms their action of November 12, 1964 regarding the purchase of land 99.6 feet in width lying between Grand River Avenue and Saginaw Street west and adjacent to the Fairview School site, which is owned by the Board of Education, to be used for street purposes.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

STREETS COMMITTEE

S-1-62F

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz, that the Board notify City Council that they approve the Final Plat of Meadow Wood No. 1, and the Board recommends that it be approved by City Council subject to the following conditions:

All public improvements shall be installed with complete public utilities including water, sanitary sewers, storm sewers and full street improvements including street paving, curb and gutter, sidewalks and such other improvements as required under Section VI D of Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

The posting of financial security, as outlined in Section VI B Lansing Subdivision Regulations in the amount of:

| | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|
| Storm and Sanitary Sewers | \$75,600.00 |
| Monument Deposit | 440.00 |
| Total | \$76,040.00 |

prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

All other standards and requirements of the Michigan State Plat Act, Act 172, Public Act of 1929 as amended shall apply.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

S-12-66F

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz, that the Board notify City Council that they approve the Final Plat of Simken Village and recommends that it be approved by City Council subject to the following conditions:

All public improvements shall be installed with complete public utilities including water, sanitary sewers, storm sewers and full street improvements including street paving, curb and gutter, sidewalks and such other improvements as required under Section VI D of Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

The posting of financial security, as outlined in Section VI B Lansing Subdivision Regulations in the amount of:

| | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|
| Curb and gutter | \$ 3,700.00 |
| Monuments | 380.00 |
| Storm and Sanitary Sewers | 14,700.00 |
| Total | \$18,780.00 |

prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

All other standards and requirements of the Michigan State Plat Act, Act 172, Public Act of 1929 as amended shall apply.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

ROW-22-66

Mr. Kenneth C. Black stated that he was surprised that the Parks Board have rec-

ommended a 12 ft. drive instead of a 24 ft. one in Scott Park. The idea seems to consider this a traffic lane to the plant. State highway and traffic also consider it. He believes that anyone approving this will only fool themselves because it will be widened shortly and eventually will ruin the park.

ROW-23-66

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz, that the Board recommend to City Council that after considering the letter from Russel A. Lawler on behalf of St. Lawrence Hospital requesting the abandonment of a portion of the 1100 Block of Rose Court described as:

The West 132 ft. of Rose Court, Comm. at the N.W. corner of Lot 7, McPhersons Saginaw St. Addition, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan thence west 132 ft., thence North 50 ft., thence East 132 ft., thence South 50 ft. to beg.

that the request be approved, and further recommends that the parcel be rezoned from unzoned to "J" parking district (see Z-177-66).

The Board of Public Service recommends that this request be approved subject to the retention of easements for the construction and maintenance of utilities in the portion to be vacated.

Rose Court is a short, dead-end street and there are no future plans for its extension. In that it is not being used as a street and St. Lawrence Hospital owns the abutting property, there is no reason for the retention by the City.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-177-66

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz, that the Board recommend to City Council that a parcel in the 1100 Block of Rose Court described as:

The West 132 ft. of Rose Court described as: Comm. at the N.W. corner of Lot 7 McPherson's Saginaw St., Addition City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan thence West 132 ft., thence North 50 ft., thence East 132 ft., thence South 50 ft. to beginning

be rezoned from unzoned to "J" parking district.

This is in accordance with the other zoning and development of the adjacent properties.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

ROW-24-66

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Siebert, that the Board recommend to City Council that after considering the letter and petition by Donald E. Lamkin, Broker in behalf of the Board of Trustees of the Glad Tidings Church, Incorporated requesting the abandonment of a parcel in the 800 Block Riley St. described as:

That portion of Riley St. lying west of the West R.O.W. line of Donora St. and East of the E. R.O.W. line of the M.C.R.R. described as:

Comm at the N.E. corner of Lot 148 Hollywood Subd., City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, thence West 86.4 ft. to the M.C.R.R. ROW thence northwesterly along the MCRR ROW 52.2 ft. to the S.W. corner of Lot 92 Hollywood Subd., thence East along the south line of Lot 92, 101.5 ft., thence South 50 ft. to the point of beginning.

that the request be approved, and further recommends that the parcel be rezoned from unzoned to "B" one family residence district (see Z-178-66).

The Board of Public Service has recommended that the petition be granted subject to the retention of easements for construction and maintenance of utilities in the portion to be vacated. Michigan Bell Telephone requests a utility easement in that they have pole and guy wires in this location.

At the time the railroad grade crossing was established at Pacific Avenue, consideration was given to the establishment of it at Riley, and the decision was made to cross at Pacific. As a result the section of Riley requested for vacation has never been developed as a street.

There are no plans for the establishment of a grade crossing at Riley Street, therefore, there are no objections to the requested vacation.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-178-66

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Siebert, that the Board recommend to City Council that a parcel in the 800 Block of Riley Street described as:

That portion of Riley St. lying west of the West ROW line of Donora St. and east of the E. ROW line of the MCRR described as:

Comm. at the N.E. corner of Lot 148 Hollywood Subd., City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan thence west 86.4 ft. to the M. C. R. R. ROW, thence northwesterly along the MCRR ROW 52.2 ft. to the southwest corner of Lot 92 Hollywood Subd., thence East along the south line of Lot 92, 101.5 ft. thence south 50 ft. to the point of beginning.

from unzoned to "B" one family residence district.

This is in accordance with the other zoning and development of the adjacent properties.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

URBAN RENEWAL

Z-154-66

Mr. Reynolds gave a report on the Bannister-Schaeffer Housing project proposed for W. Jolly Road. There has been a meeting with the Mayor and Mr. Mateer, and the developer will swap land with the school. Five acres for an elementary school and five acres for parks will leave 15 acres for housing. They contemplate 180 units for the elderly and 100 low cost housing units.

Mr. Gaus asked if this were going to be used for a junior high, and was informed that it is for an elementary school. The junior high may be shifted. The housing development will go next to the shopping center.

Mr. Guernsey added that the Board of Education has been considering this neighborhood for an elementary school.

Mr. Gaus asked about the character of the developers, and was advised that this is a good plan; it does not abut residential, and no adverse reports have been received.

Mr. Gaus discussed the number of low income housing units throughout the city and asked to be shown a master plan of their proposed locations. Some discussion was held on the sites being considered.

Mr. Fink asked if the Board could have a generalized land use plan and where the sites could be within the city. Mr. Guernsey advised that the plan submitted to the Board several months ago was in effect, however, some of the sites had definitely been eliminated.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. Guernsey reported that the Staff and the Technical Coordinating Committee are working very hard on policy and on getting the data to the departments. Income appears to be absorbed and there will not be any revenue for Capital Improvements.

Mr. Fink reminded the Board that they had anticipated this, three years ago. Some discussion was held about the number of hours spent by Board members on the Capital Improvements Programs.

Mr. Black asked about city finances. Mr. Guernsey, replied that Mr. Tubbs and Mr. Burgess had a meeting with the Mayor and they will report their findings.

The Capital Improvements Program is due January 1st.

Further discussion was held on the Board's being relieved of some of its work on the Capital Improvements, although City Council have never formally approved the Capital Improvements Programs.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Fink asked about the progress of the traffic resolution made by Mr. Black and was informed that it has been referred to Council Committee on highways.

The Chairman advised that she will contact the Chairman of the Traffic Board to arrange for a joint meeting to discuss the Central City land use patterns. They were contacted on September 21st of this year.

Meeting adjourned at 10:40 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

C/M

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, November 1, 1966

Court Room No. 1
6th Floor City Hall
7:30 P.M.

Meeting was called to order at 7:40 P.M.
by Vice Chairman Kenneth Black.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Black, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—5.

Absent: Bretz, Heino and Manz—3.

The chairman explained to the audience that a quorum was lacking and that no action could be taken on any matters of rezoning or Master Plan changes.

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Fink, that all zoning and Master Plan changes be referred to the November 22nd meeting for action.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

HEARINGS

S-14-66

Delroy Manor Subdivision submitted by Noel Maxam. Mr. Vernon C. Fountain, Planner gave an explanation of the location of the site and the land use in the area.

Mr. Noel Maxam stated that the buffer strip had been set up while in the township. He mentioned the size of the lots and how they compared to the surrounding lots. They intend to construct 35 feet high duplex buildings which will leave 10 feet for a drive. The side yards will be according to legal requirements. A site plan was presented.

Mr. Black asked about the two lots on the corner. Mr. Maxam presented a sketch and stated that they did not intend to put a duplex on these lots. Mr. Maxam then mentioned the loss of parking space to the state. These two lots are to be used for parking or commercial use.

Mr. Gaus asked the average width of the lots, and was advised approximately 59

feet. Some will have small rear dimensions. The building widths will be 35 feet, leaving 10 feet for drives and side yards.

Mr. Fink asked for a floor plan. Mr. Maxam stated that none was available, but the structures will be all two bedrooms with living room, dining room, etc. The floor area will be 35 x 25.

Mr. Ronald Bos of 5027 Delray appeared and stated he represented the property owners in Delray. He asked the type of construction materials to be used, if the buildings would be sold to private individuals and the number of parking spaces? Mr. Bos further stated the concern of the property owners for the lack of green area for the children to play. They questioned the commercial area in the project.

Mr. Maxam answered that the buildings would be brick, stone or aluminum, and would be sold for about \$25,000 each primarily to people who wished to live on one side and rent the other. There will be two parking spaces per unit. Mr. Maxam went on to say that the original purchasers in this subdivision were advised of the full development plans at the time of purchase.

Mr. Bos mentioned that the closest park is 8 to 9 blocks away. He further mentioned his concern that these buildings are proposed to be two story, when the other homes in the area are all single story.

Mr. Maxam reported that these duplexes will serve as a buffer between the single family and the commercial.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-168-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 4711 S. Logan Street from "A" resident to commercial.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-169-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 5341 S.

Pennsylvania Avenue from "A" one family to "G-2" wholesale district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-170-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 4000 block Burchfield, described as:

Lot 51 through 67 Meadow Wood #1 from "A" one family residence to "C" two family district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-171-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 617 E. Miller Road from Residential "A" one family district to "F" commercial district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-172-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 700 block Banghart described as:

Lot 7, Banghart Subdivision from "B" one family residential to "J" parking district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-173-66

Mr. Leo Farhat, attorney, appeared for Mr. John Tyler in behalf of the petition to rezone a parcel in the 400 block S. Butler Blvd. described as:

E. 75.5 ft. of Lot 1, Block 9, Bush, Butler and Sparrow's Addn.

from "C" two family to "F" commercial district. Mr. Farhat advised that there is commercial development on the two corners across the street and mentioned other commercial in the area. The prospect of using this property for single family residences is out of the question. I-496 has disrupted many homes. This will be used along commercial lines for a barbecue take out restaurant. He stated he felt this would be the highest and best use of the property because of Kalamazoo now being one way.

Mr. Siebert asked if this would be strictly take out and was advised that it would be. Mr. Siebert then added that there is not much parking.

Mr. Gaus asked if the petitioner is being relocated because of I-496, and was advised that the owner has property in the area the renters of which are being forced to move.

Mr. Black asked if there were any building plans, and was advised there are none. It would have to be developed with no off-street parking.

Mr. Siebert asked if there would be a new structure, and was advised that it will be used as it is.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-174-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 6000 block Keyes described as:

Proposed plot of Potomac Park, Lot 1 2 and 3

from "A" one family residence to "C" two family district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-176-66

Mr. Alvin L. Pickett appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 2020 William Street from "B" one family residence to "C" two family district and read the information he had submitted on his petition. He advised that they had purchased the property about ten years ago, at that time renting the upstairs. As his family grew he took over the whole house, removing the outside stairway and the door. Since two years have lapsed, they are unable to convert the building back for two family. Mr. Pickett mentioned other houses in the area used for two family.

Mr. Siebert asked about the lot to the North, and was advised that it is vacant and is all fenced in. It is used as a garden. Mr. Siebert then asked about the house to the South and was advised that 904 Buffalo is two family.

Mr. Fink mentioned that it is an exceptionally wide lot. Mr. Pickett advised that the lot is 60 x 150 feet. The back yard is all fenced in and has a gate. The driveway is west of the house. There is adequate parking on the property. A patio is on the back of the house, the stairway would be on the East side, and a privacy fence would also be located on that side. Photos of the houses in the area were presented.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-179-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property of 5617 N. Grand River from "A" residential to "F" commercial district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-180-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 4806 S. Logan Street from "A" residential to "F" commercial district, however, the petitioners had presented renderings of the proposed buildings for the Board to scan.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-181-66

Mr. Harold M. Davis appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 1500 and 1600 block of W. Mt. Hope described as:

Commencing at the Southeast corner of Boston Boulevard and Mt. Hope Avenue and running thence S 89° 24' 30" E: 100 feet on the South line of Mt. Hope Avenue, thence S 0° 35' 30" W 170 feet to the point of beginning of the following described parcel

Thence S 0° 35' 30" W 60 feet, thence N 89° 24' 30" W 50 ft.; thence N 0° 35' 30" East 60 ft., thence S 89° 24' 30" E 50 ft. to the point of beginning.

Commencing at the North $\frac{1}{4}$ Post of Section 29, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, running thence N 89° 24' 30" W 360.0 ft. and S 0° 35' 30" W 180.0 ft. to the point of beginning of the following described parcel; thence S 0° 35' 30" W 100.0 feet, thence S 89° 24' 30" E 102.4 feet to the point 260.0 feet from the N/S line of said Section 29, thence Northerly 100.00 feet parallel with the N/S $\frac{1}{4}$ line thence N 89° 24' 30" west to the point of beginning.

from "J" parking and "F" commercial to "F" commercial and "J" parking district. Mr. Davis advised that American Bank and Trust Company would like to construct a branch in Colonial Village. The matter has been discussed with the Staff, the amount of parking area that could be lost in the event this would be a drive-in bank would be unreasonable, therefore the bank has agreed to a walk-in bank. The building would be 50' by 60' (3,000 square feet). Mr. Davis then explained the depth of the parking and commercial zoning of Colonial Village. A survey showed that a banking facility is greatly needed in the area. The bank has agreed that it will be strictly a walk-in, and will conform with the balance of the proposed center.

Mr. Fink asked if there would be a drive-in window, and was advised that it will be strictly walk-in.

Mr. Black asked why they desired to build on the west end, rather than the east? Mr. Davis stated that they preferred to have them on the west end. Mr. Black then added that this building would be within 40 feet of Boston Blvd. Later this 100 feet could be zoned commercial. Mr. Davis remarked that the demand for parking space is greater at the east end because of the super market, than it is at the west end.

Mr. Fink asked if the east end is used for parking now, and was advised that it is. This area is hard surfaced and would take away some parking area even though it is now zoned commercial.

Mr. Davis mentioned the number of parking spaces needed for the super market, and that he felt this would be in the best interest for the center as a whole.

Mr. Fink asked if the owners were aware that the east could be zoned back to "J" parking, and Mr. Davis replied that they were.

Mr. Siebert asked if the medical center were a part of this, and was advised that the center had purchased their land several years ago for the development of their center.

Mr. Davis then mentioned the oil company and the need for rezoning other than that set up for the rest of the Village. Some discussion followed.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-182-66

Mr. Paul Nelson appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 3015 S. Washington Avenue from "B" one family to "F" commercial district and stated that the building is 30 ft. by 60 ft. of cement block construction and it has been used for a church. It was originally built 12 years ago for some 40 people in the congregation. It has grown three fold so it is too small and it does not provide enough parking for a church. He has offered to purchase the property and wants to use it for general office quarters. He intends to occupy one half and rent the balance for office purposes or something of that nature. He stated he doesn't believe the building could be used for one family as there is no kitchen or basement. He feels it could be used for commercial. He intends to make no changes to the exterior. He presented a sketch of the interior changes.

Mr. Siebert asked if this would be office space with no commercial selling and Mr. Nelson stated that he would like to rent the other half for offices or something of that nature.

Mr. Siebert then asked if it would be used as a store, and was advised that the petitioner has two prospective tenants who would want to use it for office use. He further added that the area of parking has not been black topped. They intend to have it paved. He then added that he had been advised to ask for the "F" instead of the professional because he needs a lighted sign to advertise his business.

Mr. Reynolds asked if the church were close to the sidewalk and was advised that it is back quite a way.

Mr. Reynolds then asked if he wanted to place the sign on the building or in front of it. Mr. Nelson mentioned the fence and trees in the area that might hide the sign if it were attached to the building, and added that he would like to have the sign on a pole. Mr. Reynolds then mentioned that the property could be zoned for professional and a portion zoned "F" commercial for the erection of the sign.

Mr. Nelson replied that he would have no objection to this. He would need a sign approximately 6 by 6, the same as he has now.

Mr. Siebert asked how far from the sidewalk the sign would have to be, and asked the Staff to consider this.

Mr. Reynolds cautioned that both parties using the building would have to use the same pole for their signs.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Recess from 8:50 to 9:05 P.M.

BUSINESS SESSION

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Siebert, that the minutes of October 4th be approved as printed.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Guernsey reminded the Board that the public hearing on the Central City Plan would be held at the Lecture Hall of Lansing Community College on Tuesday, November 15 at 7:30 P.M.

Mr. Guernsey further mentioned that the City Clerk had requested that a new date be requested for the hearing on the Zoning Ordinance changes, because her office would be unable to have the notices published in time due to extra work caused by the election.

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Siebert, that the hearing on the Zoning Ordinance Changes be set for the second meeting in December.

Motion failed by dissenting votes.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Reynolds, that hearings be held on November 29th.

Motion failed by dissenting votes.

Some discussion was held on dates when the hearings could be held that would not make the meetings too lengthy, and still not be delayed too long before being referred to City Council for action.

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Fink, that the Board recommend to City Council to set the Public Hearings on the Zoning Ordinance changes Tuesday, December 6th, 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1, 6th Floor of City Hall.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Some discussion was held on whether or not to have hearings on zoning petitions received by November 10th, at the mid-month Board meeting.

STREETS COMMITTEE

S-14-66 Delray Manor

Mr. Vernon C. Fountain informed the Board of the Staff's findings on this subdivision and asked the Streets Committee if they were in agreement that a letter should be sent to the developer? The letter to contain the recommended lot size approved by the City Council and Planning Board.

BUILDINGS AND PROPERTIES

Mr. Edwin P. Brown, Assistant Director, discussed the Consumers Power right-of-way that runs from city limits to city limits, in an east-west direction and the proposed use of this as a walkway or nature trail. Renderings by Mr. Jack Drew showing the right-of-way, and its relationship to the surrounding area were shown to the Board.

Meetings have been held with representatives of Consumers Power and they seem to be in agreement with the plan, and with the stipulation that there be no digging and no wheel bearing devices other than maintenance equipment.

No determination has been made on the maintenance of the walkway.

Some discussion was held on the dangers of the high tension wires and the possibility of children climbing towers.

It was mentioned that Consumers might have the "Hold Harmless Laws." Mr. Brown was asked to check into this further.

Some discussion was then held on the development West of Cedar St., South of Jolly Road, relative to the possibility of moving a school site to enable a larger housing development behind the shopping center.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Siebert, that a letter of appreciation be forwarded to Jack Drew for the renderings on the Consumers Power Parkway concept.

Mr. Black questioned if this is the proper time to submit this letter. Some discussion was held on this, and it was made clear that there was no connection between the development of any of these projects and the Drew organization.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. Reynolds distributed a booklet on Urban Renewal Progress, and advised that at their next meeting they will be considering certain Urban Renewal properties and recommending to Council that they be demolished to help relieve the parking situation.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. Guernsey mentioned that inasmuch as Mr. Heino, chairman of this committee is ill, that perhaps another board member could be assigned to work on this phase. The CIP program is scheduled to be submitted to Council before January 1st, therefore the work load of this committee will start immediately.

Some discussion was held on the possibility of having another member named to the Board. Mr. Guernsey informed the Board that the Rules of Procedure require that six members are needed for a recommendation on a zoning matter, but the State statute requires six votes for any changes of the Master Plan which would include plats. Mr. Fink asked for a clarification of the statute on the number of votes needed to pass on a zoning recommendation. Mr. Guernsey replied that he would report on this at the next meeting.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The displays that will be placed in the lecture hall were explained. The program and those that will be giving presentations were named. It was further requested that inasmuch as there will be refreshments served, that the Board members ask their wives if they would be willing to act as hostesses.

Mr. Guernsey also related that he had received a verbal invitation from the Traffic Engineer inviting the Board to attend their meeting on Wednesday, November 9th at 7:30 P.M.

Mr. Fink suggested that the Staff attend this meeting and present the information to the Board.

Some discussion was held on the importance of a joint meeting of the two Boards.

Mr. Black added that the meeting of the Boards should be special meeting to be devoted entirely to traffic problems.

Z-122-65

Mr. Guernsey mentioned the necessity of revision of the site plan as requested by FHA and further remarked on the cooperation between the Developers, FHA, and the city. Progress is being made, however the plan is not ready for approval.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Siebert, that a letter of thanks be forwarded to Gib Butler for a copy of the book "Anatomy of a Watershed."

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

NEW BUSINESS

On the tour of Midway Industrial Center, it was the consensus that those at the meeting would be able to make a tour at 7:00 A.M. on Friday, November 18th.

Meeting adjourned at 10:42 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Special Meeting, November 15, 1966

Community College
Lecture Hall
404 Seymour Street
7:30 P.M.

Present were: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Absent: Heino—1.

Mr. David Machtel, Master of Ceremonies, introduced Mayor Max Murningham and Councilman Moore, Perrin, Bradshaw, Anas and Belen.

Mayor Murningham welcomed the approximately 180 people in the audience and asked for their participation.

Mayor ProTem Moore thanked the audience for their attendance and encouraged their interest in the program.

Mr. Charles Lehman, Consultant, from Vilcan-Lehman and Associates of Southfield, Michigan discussed the results of the study.

Mr. Stan Woodhouse, of the Vilcan-Lehman firm, analyzed the phases of the study.

President Gannon of Lansing Community College, stated that they are serving three counties now, and hope to be covering 6 counties within the next ten years. Felt that 12,000 students should be the limit to the present campus, and the three outlying campuses which will be 10 to 15 years ahead. They plan to have 4 colleges in the downtown area (these are called unit colleges) semi-autonomous, being liberal arts and health, occupations (possibly 3,000 students), vocational and technical and a fine arts. Parking will be provided. It is believed that this college will be very unique.

Councilman Horace J. Bradshaw, stated that in 1964 the city authorized a study on parking. March 1965 it was recommended that several parking garages be constructed. He also mentioned the combinations to be used in conjunction with parking ramps. He further discussed the parking mall in the 100, 200 and 300 blocks of South Washington Avenue.

Mr. Allen T. Hayes, Traffic Engineer for the City, discussed plans for 20 controlled traffic signal lights to be placed throughout the city. These lights will adjust with the traffic flow. He further remarked that I-496 causes traffic problems, the trees being cut down block traffic. He further mentioned other traffic problems and that he is working for a solution to them. He concluded that the city had purchased 8 new buses, and these together with the 6 old ones gave the city good public transportation. The service is dependable. The city is vitally interested in the mass transit program.

Councilman Frank Perrin presented a background of Grand River development and conservation. June 20th, 1966 Council adopted a resolution establishing a riverwalk committee. One of the responsibilities was to provide a parkway along both sides of the Grand River bank. This area has a high density of businesses serving many people. Plans are for having benches, boat docks, gondola type boats, paddle boats, facilities for an outdoor theatre, concession stands and to provide an overall pleasant atmosphere. This will be for the enjoyment of all age groups. It is felt it may be a major attraction. This may also add income to the city. Owners of private land may upgrade. It is hoped to have the plaza completed within two years for the theatre. It may take 10 years to complete the whole project. The city should be known as one that did something with its river front.

Mr. Morris Stein of the architectural firm of Frank and Stein presented slides of the proposed walkway.

Mr. Claude Erickson, General Manager of the Board of Water and Light discussed the dam in North Lansing, the Eckert station across on Moores Park and the Boards program for developing fountains. Fountains have been recommended for on the river and also across from Moores Park. Lights and music would make these sites very attractive.

Mr. Everett Eschbach, chairman of the Redevelopment Board told of the special meeting of their board today which authorized the hiring of an architect to make a layout for the purpose of determining which space will be provided for existing business and new businesses who wish to relocate. The architect is to make lay-

outs and then will try to work with those interested. He then mentioned demolitions in the Urban Renewal area and this will provide parking space in the immediate future. It is felt we should be very proud of the end result of these studies. Lansing is in a transition period.

Mr. Patrick J. Callihan, of the Lansing Area Redevelopment Corporation stated that their purpose is two fold; to make money and help in improving the future of downtown Lansing. They want to design a project that would have enough density that would justify cost of land and will form an anchor and nucleus in the 100 block of Michigan Avenue. Plans call for a full time department store of three floors, about 200,000 square feet of space; a 250 room twelve story motel and all amenities. Over the department store will be a 17 story office structure of about 205,000 square feet of rentable space. Connected to this will be the parking ramp. There will be a high concentration of people and services in this area. They will have a progress report in the next two or three weeks on how they are coming.

Mr. Carl Johnson, of Johnson, Johnson and Roy remarked that today we are moving fast and forgetting the major objectives of what is Lansing. Feels this report excellent guide lines. The capital city should be a central image, a marvelous vista. He expressed his concern about what facilities are worthy of the capital city. We don't want to design out of context. Feels that there is a solid framework to hang progress on. Must not be used out of scale with the Capital city. Should not over-develop the Urban Renewal Project. The river walk to the south, the trees must remain and must be included in any plans.

Mr. Clarence Rosa, from the State of Michigan Building Division, stated that the Lewis Cass Building was built in 1922, and the Stephens T. Mason in 1951 and little else has been completed for the central governmental function. Facilities are crowded and inadequate. State is renting space in more than 40 locations paying \$6 million dollars in rent. Much construction is going on. Parking ramp should be in use before Christmas, with three new buildings planned for the Highway Revenue and a 7 story general office building. Seven story occupation in spring of 1968. The next phase will be to the west, presently used for parking. This will have underground parking and the supreme court building. Phase 3 will be the Capitol. Present structure is 90 years old and has many hazards, causes many problems. They will start to acquire land from the north. Do not want to find themselves land-locked. Later 250,000 sq. feet of office space will be needed. The population growth and the service the government has to furnish, means more office space. This addition of 250,000 sq. ft. would accommodate only the offices in Lansing. There is quite a strong move to place all central administrative offices

now in Detroit and throughout the state in this area, which will mean approximately 250,000 square feet more of office space. They are making many other plans. The extent of the work will depend on state economy and what the government wants developed.

Mr. Richard Kositchek, representing the Downtown Business Association, mentioned they are concerned for the downtown. They are pleased with the work done by the city. Are concerned with the Urban Renewal Plan progress and offered their help to the city or agencies involved in these projects. He further stated that such a letter is on file with the city.

Mr. Al Boyd, Secretary of the Chamber of Commerce, stated that the heart of the metropolitan area is their concern. Between 1965 and 1980 may see many changes in the heart of the metropolitan Lansing area. Lansing is growing up. Unfortunately not many see the signs. Business must move forward. Unless the central core is healthy, attractive and inviting, it cannot compete with other communities. There are 3500 units of the Chamber of Commerce that belong to the United States Chamber of Commerce and this may be reduced to 200 first class metropolitan areas. They are interested in this. This isn't just retail. The core city is more than retail. He mentioned visitors, because of conventions and sports events, and stated we must create things that will impress people. Their organization will support wholeheartedly.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Mr. Callihan asked Mr. Erickson of the Board of Water and Light if any consideration had been given to a face lifting to the building on Grand Avenue. Mr. Erickson replied that he thought the building was alright as it depicted the era in which it was built. He gave the background of the buildings that had been in the area. He stated they will maintain their property in keeping with the surrounding area.

Mr. Hayes was asked what provisions will be made for the 10 minute shopper, and he replied that the ramps will have easy ingress and egress, are well planned for shopper parking. Other ramps in the planning stage, will make it even more convenient to use the ramps.

Mr. Rosa was asked how soon they would request the moving of people in the proposed Capitol expansion area. Mr. Rosa explained that they expect to keep East of Butler. They have no specific plans for a move. They are in a position to buy when the land is available.

Mr. Callihan was asked if he had any information available concerning major department store. Mr. Callihan replied that he would like to defer any comments at this time.

Mr. Raymond C. Guernsey commented that the city of Lansing is not an ordinary city. We should strive to be extraordinary. We have the ability to make a beautiful community. This presentation is not a final plan. The city may proceed and it may be changed. Perhaps some day Washington may be closed, covered overhead, heated and air conditioned. There are many more steps to take, the most important are mass transit, off-street parking, the school system, housing for the elderly, and utility services in the downtown area. He urged that there be foresight so that the capitol city does not perish.

Mayor Murningham thanked everyone for their interest. He suggested that some time be spent on the booklets presented. He mentioned that this is not the end, it is only the beginning. There is a tremendous amount of money being spent today in development of the center city. The city wants to utilize other money for the further development.

Meeting adjourned at 9:55 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

T/C

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, November 22, 1966

Meeting called to order at 7:46 P.M. by the Chairman Ramona Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.
Absent: None.

HEARINGS

Z-84-66

Mr. Francis N. Fine, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 3313 W. Mt. Hope Avenue, from "A" one family residence to "D-M" multiple dwelling district. Mr. Fine stated that they originally proposed a 142 foot frontage site at Mt. Hope. They have acquired an additional 100 ft. He stated that the second objection was that people on Glasgow felt that they did not like multiple dwelling in back of them. They have eliminated everything except single family south of Cooley. The third objection was that there was no provision made for another street to run East and West (Lewton). They have taken that into consideration. They feel that the type and mode of living has changed in the last few years. 50% of the dwelling units constructed are multiple dwellings and apartments, and the other 50% are single family. He stated he feels this trend will continue as it has many advantages. There are considerably less school children with the multiple family because they are all either young people just getting started or older people—both without children. Taxes to the community are generally greater. 12 units per acre, the tax rate will be about 2½ times over that of a single family. This area is immediately adjacent to a trailer park which would not make it advantageous for good houses. The units proposed will require a decorative retaining wall along the West side of the property. The land is about 750 ft. from Lewton School boundary. On the other side of the street there is one residence that faces this property. The type of unit proposed is really transitional between apartment and multiple dwelling. We feel that it would be a betterment to the neighborhood. Homes in the neighborhood would be benefited. He mentioned other areas in the state where this type of project was next to single family houses. They propose to build houses south of Cooley and that they

will provide buffer for the homes facing Mt. Hope.

Mr. Reynolds asked if Cooley will be dedicated and was informed that it would be.

Mr. Mooris Stein, Architect, presented and discussed the site plan. They plan on 90 units or 12 units per acre. Each will have a basement, first and second floor like a two story house. The only difference being they are being grouped together. The buildings will be basically 26 x 32 ft. in depth.

The neighborhood is largely commercial. There are no present plans for improvement of the area. The interior will also be remodeled. They want to erect a 20 x 20 ft. addition to the building.

Mr. Siebert asked the size of the present building, and was informed it is about 25 ft. x 40 ft.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-180-66

Mr. Howard DeWolf, architect, representing Marvin DeWald appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 4806 S. Logan Street from "A" residential to "F" commercial district. Mr. DeWolf mentioned a letter submitted to the Planning Director this summer. He read comments from the letter to the Staff. Mr. DeWald wants to remain on this property, and would like to upgrade it, by tearing down the old buildings. They feel this is a valid reason for granting the petition.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-183-66

Mr. Leo Farhat, Attorney, appeared for Casa Nova, Inc. in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 1117 Goodrich from "B" one residence to "J" parking district. Mr. Farhat explained that Casa Nova wish to enlarge their parking lot. Business is good and they need more parking. They can't back-up on Logan, and

want them to stay off Goodrich. They maintain their parking lots. This will make it more convenient for their customers and better for the neighbors.

Mr. Fink asked how many parking spaces this lot will provide and was advised about 20. Mr. Fink then asked if an additional curb cut would be necessary? Mr. Farhat explained there are no curb cuts there now. They may desire to re-arrange their entire parking. Cars will not be allowed to go out on Goodrich. They now go out on Logan. Mr. Fink then asked if this is east of the proposed development of Logan one-way pair, and was advised that the acquisition of this may take place.

Mr. Black questioned the number of additional parking spaces this lot will provide.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-184-66

Mr. Leo A. Farhat, Attorney, appeared for Warner & Long Development Corporation, in behalf of the petition to rezone a parcel at 3328 West Jolly Road, from "A" residential to "D-M" multiple dwelling district. Mr. Farhat advised that the developers have acquired this property and wish to remove the dwelling and construct a multiple dwelling of 16 units. Using the new yard requirements, they can't put in more than this number with the minimum parking of two cars for each unit. Mr. Farhat suggested that the Planning Board recommend favorably to the rezoning conditioned upon an agreement that it be deed restricted. He stated he wondered if deed restrictions would be valid and asked if an opinion had been received from the City Attorney. He remarked he was unable to get a copy from the City Attorney. He asked if a restricted use as a condition to rezoning is possible and asked further if there is anything legal or arbitrary to such a stipulation. The property is too deep for one family use. It is also too deep to be limited to 4 or 5 families. Mr. Guernsey asked if this is part of the original property platted to the North? He couldn't tell for sure, but believed it was not a part of the original parcel.

Mr. Fink asked if Mr. Farhat was aware of any decisions in the state concerning deed restrictions, or any other decisions, and if this is within the jurisdiction of the city. Mr. Farhat answered he had no such knowledge.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-185-66

Mr. William Martin, representing the Bank of Lansing, appeared in behalf of the

petition to rezone the property in the 5100 and 5200 Blocks of S. Cedar Street, described as:

That part of the N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 4, T3N, R2W, described as:

Beginning on the W. line of Cedar St. 713 ft. S. of the N. line of Section 4, T3N, R2W, thence S. 150 feet on the W. line of Cedar St.; thence W. 200 ft.; thence N. 150 ft.; thence E. 200 feet to the point of beginning, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from Parking and Commercial to "J" parking and "F" commercial district. Mr. Martin stated that the zoning needs re-arrangement. Approval has been received from the banking commission and this development is in accordance with the Master Plan for the entire area.

Mr. Reynolds asked if the property is zoned for a drive-in, would there be plenty of parking to keep the customers from backing up on the street. Mr. Martin presented the plans. Some discussion was held on the area.

Mr. Black questioned the set-back, and was advised it is proposed to be about 25 ft. Mr. Black then asked why isn't the building back in line with other buildings, and was informed that it is un-economical to waste that much ground. A drawing was submitted.

Mr. Reynolds then asked if the building couldn't be set back further than the 25 ft. Mr. Martin remarked that they might be willing to set back some. He thought a hardship would be caused if the building was put back too far. Mr. Reynolds suggested that they work with the Staff on the setback.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-186-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 3435 West Holmes Road from "A" one family to "D" apartment district.

Mr. Richard Moore, 3347 Glenbrook Drive mentioned that some of the property owners in the area objected to the rezoning and would like to keep it in the "A" one family. He mentioned there would be a lot of traffic. The closing of Glenbrook would be a nuisance. He presented a petition signed by about 300 people in the area.

Mr. Black asked if there were an exit on Berwick, and was informed that Lot 243 belongs to the city.

Mr. Manz asked if the factory was still non-conforming or could it still operate there? Mr. Guernsey stated that he believed it could be operated.

Mr. Fink asked what is on the site now at the end of Glenbrook, and was advised there are secondary buildings there now. There is no noise from it.

Mr. Lewis Baker of 4001 Hillborn Lane, told of how long he had known this neighborhood. Mentioned traffic on Logan and on Holmes. He added that allowing 38 units would add 300 cars to the area. He mentioned he didn't think the Board would allow any more homes out there. There would be no privacy in the back yards. He would rather see the land vacant than 300 cars in the area. He further made some suggestions on driveways and turns and that the cuts should be wider.

Mr. James D. Woodward, 3621 Berwick Drive, stated that the homes are on medium sized lots and in the middle price range. He feels that the apartments would infringe on his privacy. The people in this area are proud of the neighborhood and this would be a serious threat to the value of their property.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-187-66

Mr. Robert Harper, owner of the property at 328 Lathrop and 1411 E. Kalamazoo Street, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone from "C" two family to "F" commercial and "J" parking district. Mr. Harper stated that the property at 328 Lathrop he proposes for "J" parking. Would like to make a 200 ft. extension on the East side of Kalamazoo for elevator to the upstairs. He has been in the neighborhood many years. This type of business is new. There is no noise. There will be only small trucks unloading. The only parking there will be are for his employees.

Mr. Reynolds asked if he would continue to operate the body shop and was advised he would not.

Mr. Manz asked if "F" commercial wasn't what the petitioner needed. There was some discussion on whether the "F" could cover his needs.

Mr. Fink asked if this were a vacant building now, and was advised that it had been vacant for two months. A house is to be removed. He also owns houses next to that one but they will stay as is.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-188-66

Mr. Thayer Winegardner, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone parcels in the 1800 and 1900 blocks Hoyt Street described as:

Lots 36, 37, 38, 61, 62 and 63 of Good-homes Subdivision, City of Lansing,

from "A" one family residential to "D-M" multiple dwelling district. Mr. Winegardner advised that he is one of the owners, and pointed out the location of the property. The area has been more or less isolated because it was in the township. These lots are in a recorded subdivision and very few were developed. Since coming into the city they feel the logical use of the property is for multiple dwellings. Lots are 100 ft. by 407 ft. and they feel that this type of development would be a great advantage to the area. Aurelius Road will be extended to the North and will give greater access to the area. Frank and Stein, Architects, prepared a drawing on the type of development proposed for each of the six lots. Area would allow about 27 units, however, they are requesting only 18 units. By placing 18 units on a lot this would cover less than 1/3 of the lot area, providing for considerable open area. They have also provided for more than two parking spaces. There is considerable open area in this location. On Ruth St., about 16 or 17 acres are being dedicated to the city adjacent to Scott Court.

Mr. Black asked, on the property to the north of this you have proposed a turn around. If unable to acquire turn around will you dedicate 66 ft. for a roadway in the hopes that the city will obtain property north of this?

Mr. Manz mentioned that some of the area along Aurelius Road would be used for widening, and asked if they would deed 17 feet for Aurelius Road? Mr. Winegardner, replied that he would be happy to do that, and he hoped the city would contact them at this time.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-189-66

Mr. John Henderson, representing Central Advertising Company, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 2400 East Kalamazoo Street from "B" one family residence to "F" commercial district. Mr. Henderson, stated that the reason for asking for the rezoning is that this piece of land lends itself more to commercial zoning than to the "B" one. He mentioned zoning in the area.

Mr. Gaus, asked if he intended commercial use for it now, and was advised that it is now being used in a non-conforming status.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-171-66

Mrs. Mattie Lee Atwater, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 617 E. Miller Road from "A" one family

to "F" commercial district. Mrs. Atwater stated that she received her card after the hearing had been held. She advised that at the time she purchased the property she planned to build a nursing home. She would like it to be commercial as her property abuts commercial. She told of the houses in the area. There is a house on her property now.

Mr. Reynolds asked if she would tear the old buildings down, and she advised she would.

Mr. Fink asked if she intends to use it for a nursing home with the shopping center there now, and she replied that it may make a difference.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Recess from 9:46 to 10:20 P.M.

BUSINESS SESSION

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Fink, that the minutes of October 6 and 11 be approved.

Motion carried by unaniomus vote.

It was the consensus of the Board that a hearing be set on an amendment to the Subdivision Regulations at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1, 6th Floor of City Hall on Tuesday, January 17, 1967.

Z-196-66

Public hearing was set for December 20, 1966 on the Community Unit Plan submitted by Francis N. Fine, for property at the Northwest corner of Pleasant Grove and Reo Road.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-81-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Fink, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by James and Lorraine Root and Jean and Charles Felice, to rezone a parcel at 1212 and 1218 West Jolly Road, from "A" residential to "D-M" multiple dwelling revised to Community Unit Plan, be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. That the density be limited to twelve units per acre.
2. That the minimum parking space be two spaces per unit.

3. That the location of buildings, drives and off-street parking be essentially as shown on the approved plan, requiring 42 ft. front yards, taking into consideration the future widening of Jolly Road.
4. The height of the proposed buildings shall not exceed 3 stories or 45 ft.
5. That the property lines on the east, north and west sides be suitably screened with evergreen shrubs having a mature height of not less than four feet, and that the petitioners have a mutual agreement with the Building Department concerning the implementation of his requirement before issuance of occupancy permits.
6. That the final approval is valid for one year from the date of approval by the Lansing City Council.

The property adjacent to the area included in the plan will not be adversely affected.

The plan at 12 dwelling units per acre is a transition between existing residential and commercial land use intended for the area.

The plan is consistent with the intent and purpose to promote public health, safety, morals and general welfare.

The land use and land use regulations within the plan and the effect on the adjacent properties are in keeping with the general intent of the Zoning Code.

The buildings shall be used only for multiple dwellings and the usual accessory uses such as parking, storage space, etc.

The plan as approved, indicates the uses proposed for this development, these are in keeping with Section 36-7 of the Zoning Code.

Other than in the Central City Area, the policy of the Planning Board, wherever possible, has been to maintain a density of 12 units per acre on apartment developments.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-84-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Reynolds, that the petition by Francis N. Fine, to rezone the property at 3313 W. Mt. Hope Avenue from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be tabled for thirty days for a study of the vacant land in the area.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-142-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council, that the request for withdrawal of the petition by Fred S. Vorn to rezone a parcel in the 100 block of East Saginaw Street described as:

Parcel I: Commencing at the N.W. corner of Lot 1, Block 53, Original Plat, thence South 11 rods; thence E. 7 rods, thence N. 103.75 feet; thence W. $4\frac{1}{2}$ rods; thence N. 77.75 feet; thence W. $2\frac{1}{2}$ rods to the point of beginning; City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan.

Parcel II: Also the West 136 feet of the S. 5 rods of the N. 16 rods of Lot 1, Block 53, Original Plat, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan.

Parcel III: Also the S. $26\frac{1}{2}$ feet of Lot 4 and the N. 20 feet of Lot 3, Block 53, Original Plat, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan. To include any and all of driveway rights of record; and subject to restrictions, rights and easements of record.

Parcel IV: All that part of Lot 1, Block 53, of the Original Plat, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, according to the Plat thereof recorded in Liber 2 of Plats, Page 36, 37 and 38, Ingham County Records, described as: Beginning at a point which is West 173.25 feet and North 41.25 feet from the intersection of the centerline of Saginaw Street and the centerline of Grand Avenue, extended; thence North a distance of 123.75 feet; thence East a distance of 99 feet; thence South a distance of 123.75 feet, to the North line of Saginaw Street; thence West a distance of 99 feet to the point of beginning.

Parcel V: Commencing $2\frac{1}{2}$ rods East of the Northwest corner of Lot 1, Block 53, thence South 77.75 feet, thence East 74.25 feet, thence West 74.25 feet to place of beginning, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, subject to easements and restrictions of record.

Parcel VI: Commencing at the Southeast corner of Lot No. 2 of Block No. 53, Original Plat, City of Lansing, thence North to Northeast corner of Lot No. 2, thence East 2 rods, thence South to a point directly East of the place of beginning, thence West 2 rods to the beginning.

from "H" light industrial to "G" business district be denied, and that the petition continue its normal process and that the property be zoned "D" professional offices district.

On August 9, 1966 the applicant requested a change of zoning from "H" to "G" which would allow a four story office building to be erected on the site. This was not possible in the "H" light industrial district because of the height limitations.

On August 12, 1966, the applicant requested a waiver of the height limitations

of the "H" light industrial district to the Board of Zoning Appeals. On August 26, 1966 the Board of Zoning Appeals considered the request and tabled the matter pending the Planning Board's recommendation on the zoning request. The Staff and Planning Board recommended that this property be zoned "D-1" professional offices district. This recommendation was forwarded to City Council on September 21st.

The Board considered the following factors in making their recommendations:

The Board is not adverse to office use on the site, but believes that general business with 120 ft. height limitations would not be in the best interest of the City and not in accordance with good planning principles.

The secretary of the Planning Board was directed to forward this information to the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Based on this recommendation and other testimony and evidence presented to the Board of Zoning Appeals by the applicant, the Board granted the request permitting a structure to be erected on the subject property to a height of three stories or 45 ft.

The Board believes that the city has acted in good faith in this matter allowing relief from the strict application of the Zoning Code permitting the development of the property in accordance with the development in the area. Not overlooking the fact that the property borders the area proposed for Lansing Community College expansion, it is generally agreed between the Community College and the City of Lansing, that future development adjacent to the Community College be directed toward compatible and desirable development. Future renewal action would be directed toward the same end.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-149-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Ivan V. Bartha to rezone a parcel of land abutting North of 820 N. Sycamore St. described as:

All that part of Lots 21 and 22 of Block No. 1 of O. F. Barnes Subdivision on Block 27, Original Plat, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan as recorded, which lies Southeasterly of a line 45 ft. southeasterly of (measured at right angles) and parallel to a line described as:

Beginning at a point on the centerline of Chicago Avenue which is 20 feet North along said centerline from

its intersection with the centerline of Oakland Avenue; thence South 88 deg. 27' 32" East, parallel with the centerline of Oakland Avenue, a distance of 223.20 feet to the point of curvature of a 1145.92 foot radius curve to the left (chord bearing North 81 deg. 00' 35" East); thence Northeasterly along the arc of said curve 421.25 feet to the point of tangency of said curve; thence North 70 deg. 28' 43" East a distance of 278.61 feet to the point of curvature of a 1145.92 foot radius curve to the right (chord bearing North 81 deg. 02' 35" East); thence East along the arc of said curve 422.58 feet to the point of tangency of said curve and a point of ending,

from "C" two family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied.

All plans for this site submitted by the applicant violate the Zoning Code, either by building encroachment into the required yards or front yard parking. This is a definite indication of over-development of the land.

It is not impossible to develop the site in accord with the existing regulations of "C" two family.

Recent amendments to the "D-M" multiple dwelling district limit the number of living units on the site to six, and increase the required off-street parking to two spaces per unit, a total of 12 spaces, but does not provide for minimum recreational area, which would be critical at this location.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert.

Nays: None.

Z-152-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Joe D. Pentecost, to rezone a parcel at 909 W. Holmes Road from "H" industrial and "J" parking to "F" commercial district as filed be denied, and the property be zoned "J" parking with controlled access on Holmes Road.

Traffic circulation at this location is critical and the proposed use of the land in question would add to the problem.

It may be necessary to acquire additional land to help relieve the traffic problem at the intersection of S. Washington Avenue and Holmes Road, and until this problem is solved, development at this intersection should be held at status quo.

Additional information regarding traffic problems submitted by the Traffic Engineer is as follows:

1. In view of the proximity of the subject property to the intersection of W. Holmes Road and S. Washington Avenue it is felt that ingress and egress points on Holmes Road would cause serious congestion and confusion at the intersection. This coupled with the already existing problem we have at the east drive into Topps and Big "E", which is immediately west of the subject property, would make it extremely difficult to move the present volumes of traffic through the area safely and efficiently.

TO DATE ACCIDENTS

| | | | |
|------|----|------|----|
| 1966 | 15 | 1963 | 14 |
| 1965 | 15 | 1962 | 5 |
| 1964 | 37 | 1961 | 7 |

HOLMES ROAD E. of Washington (WB)

| | | | |
|------|-----------|------|-------|
| 1966 | No Record | 1963 | 4,805 |
| 1965 | 4,503 | 1962 | 3,147 |
| 1964 | No Record | 1961 | 3,221 |

E. of Logan (EB)

| | | | |
|------|-----------|------|-------|
| 1966 | No Record | 1963 | 4,177 |
| 1965 | 6,515 | 1962 | 5,557 |
| 1964 | No Record | 1961 | 5,084 |

WASHINGTON N. of Holmes (SB)

| | | | |
|------|-----------|------|-------|
| 1966 | 5,683 | 1963 | 5,030 |
| 1965 | No Record | 1962 | 4,233 |
| 1964 | 5,001 | 1961 | 4,090 |

Fixed time controlled installed September 9, 1964, changed to Semi-Actuated traffic signal controller, November 17, 1964, (detector on N. leg Washington only detecting southbound traffic on Washington).

Changed to fully actuated

Detectors on all three legs—E., W. and N. detecting all traffic into intersection.

As you know we have had problems at this intersection. Problems involve turning movements at the intersection and to the west to and from Holmes. The proposed location of this drive-in facility would further congest the intersection and the area.

It would not be possible to allow left turns from Holmes westbound into the drive-in as westbound thru traffic is con-

fined to one lane. Vehicles leaving the drive-in to go north would conflict with the left turn south to east. There are other problems involving ability to safely leave the drive-in due to the eastbound traffic movement. At times it is very difficult to get onto Holmes from the east exit from the present Shopping Center. If the drive-in were located where planned we would be compelled to put a median barrier in the center of Holmes west of Washington to prohibit left turns into the drive-in and prohibit vehicles leaving the drive-in from going west on Holmes.

We suggest that if permission is granted to place this drive-in at this location that ingress and egress at Holmes be prohibited.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-153-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Gary L. Sarlouis, to rezone a parcel at 914 N. Pine Street from "C" two family to "D-M" multiple (4 family) district be denied.

The change of zoning would create an isolated district, i.e. this would be a spot zone.

The land area of this parcel is not adequate to accommodate two additional apartment units as proposed.

Development in the area has not been contrary to the existing regulations.

The Board cannot find any substantial reasons why the property cannot be used in accord with the existing regulations.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-155-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Leslie E. Decker, representative for Small Brothers Oil Co., to rezone a parcel at 5963 South Cedar St., from "T" commercial to "E-2" commercial district as filed be denied, and that the

"easterly 40 ft. lying parallel to Cedar Street"

remain in "J" parking and

"The balance of the property" be zoned "E-2" drive-in shop.

The change of zoning would remove the area now zoned "J" parking, which was set up to provide for proper building setbacks and off-street parking along this area of Cedar St.

Mr. Black asked if the pumps be put in the 40 ft. and was advised that they can not, however, this has increased the commercial area by 10 ft. This will conform with the setback along this street.

Mr. Reynolds mentioned if the pumps are bothered by the viaduct this will bother the hotel.

Motion failed by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—5.

Nays: Black, Gaus and Manz—3.

Z-156-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by B. B. Friedland, to rezone a parcel at 1024 Center Street from "H" light industrial to "I" heavy industrial district be denied as filed, and that the

South 60 ft. of Lots 3 and 4, and the South 60 ft. of the west 27 ft. of Lot 2, also the north 40 ft. of the west 145.14 ft. of Lot 6, all in Block 20, Original Plat City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

be rezoned "I" heavy industrial.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as industrial.

The steel salvage use is non-conforming and is limited to development or installation of modern equipment.

The residential area is in a state of transition, and will eventually be cleared for industrial expansion.

Mr. Gaus asked how it was possible for Council to set a hearing date for this petition when our Board had not made their recommendation yet?

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-157-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Reynolds, that the petition by Beneicke and Krue, to rezone a parcel at 3535 Moores River Drive

from "A" one family to Community Unit Plan be tabled for thirty days to study the entire area.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-158-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Vernell S. Meese, to rezone a parcel at 4819 S. Pennsylvania Avenue, from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple district be denied, and further recommends that the property adjacent to the South described as:

Lot 28 and commencing Northwest corner Lot 28 thence East 132 feet, North 25 feet, West 132 feet, South 25 feet to beginning; Pleasant Ridge Plat also Lot 29, Pleasant Ridge Plat, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

be rezoned from "D-M" multiple dwelling district to "A" one family residence district.

The Board believes that this recommendation is in keeping with sound zoning principles and would return the stability to the developed single family area.

Apartment development is generally accepted as a transition between single family development and commercial or industrial, and where possible additional open space is encouraged between the multiple development and single family.

The change of zoning would allow development that would adversely affect the adjacent single family residential development by the increase of traffic and activity.

Direct encroachment of the privacy of single family homes.

Where an apartment zone abuts a single family zone, the edges of the latter are subject to adverse influences and pressures of greater population and building densities, higher and larger buildings, greater traffic and similar factors.

Such single family residential property may be less desirable, its values may be reduced and the area can be generally less stable.

The Board's action would be consistent with the hope for development of the entire area.

Mr. Fink asked if a legal description was needed for the lot on the South?

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-159-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Alfred McCarroll to rezone a parcel at the southwest corner of Butler and Lenawee Sts. described as:

East 70 feet of Lot 1, Block 8, Bush, Butler and Sparrow's Addition, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "C" two family to "F" commercial district be denied.

The environment created by this proposed use (mixed commercial and residential) would not be consistent with the intent of the Zoning Code, i.e.: to promote public health, safety, morals and general welfare.

The Central City Plan shows this area as residential.

Piecemeal, individual parcel development is not compatible with Lansing's Master Plan recommendations, and this change of zoning would create a spot zone not in harmony with the surrounding zoning or land use.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-160-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by James R. Duncan, Broker, for Daisy T. Angell, to rezone a parcel at 5500 South Cedar Street, from "A" one family to "C" two family district be granted, subject to the submission of a plat to the area.

The rezoning would allow comprehensive development of a large tract of vacant land.

The site is bordered by an industrial zone required in the proposed mobile home ordinance, as recommended to the City Council.

The site has access to a major street with both shopping facilities and employment centers, in close proximity.

The corridor of land lying between Cedar and Pennsylvania and bounded by Baker on the North and Miller on the South is predominantly residential. "C" two family zoning would extend this desirable use and would tend to resist pressures for uses other than residential as exemplified by the variety of uses existing on Cedar and Pennsylvania.

Mr. Gaus asked if the "C" two family zoning could be used for Mobile Home, and was advised that it can not. This is based on the new ordinance which would permit

mobile homes. Mr. Gaus stated his concern over the fact that the "A" one family classification is being pushed out of the area. There was some discussion about the variety of uses in the area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: Gaus—1.

Z-161-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Darwin D. Worden, to rezone a parcel at 3826 S. Logan from "A" one family residential to commercial district, be denied as filed, and that

"The West of 20 ft. of the property"

be rezoned from "A" one family to "J" parking and the

"Balance of the property"

be rezoned to "F" commercial district.

Screening to consist of one of the following except for a 20 ft. setback on Hillcrest St.

A dense privet hedge of a height of 5 ft.

A 3 ft. high chain link fence with dense evergreen plantings of a mature height of 5 ft. to 5 ft. 6 in.

A 5 ft. high chain link fence with interwoven redwood slats.

Any other screening as may be suggested by the petitioner with approval of the Planning Board.

The site requested for rezoning falls within the strip commercial development along this area of S. Logan Street.

The commercial use on the site is non-conforming, and is limited to the type of improvement expansion.

Considering the development on the site, and in the immediate area it is unreasonable to assume that the existing zoning is proper.

This falls within the "Policy for Commercial Zoning on west side of Logan between Holmes and Pierce Road."

Mr. Manz asked for a clarification on the "J" parking.

Mr. Black asked if this would allow the partition to be put on the building, and was advised that it would allow the addition on the North side.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-162-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Howard Soldan, to rezone a parcel at 5200 South Logan, from "A" one family to "F-1" commercial district, be denied at this time and the property owner be encouraged to redevelop the site showing proper building setbacks and off-street parking.

In general, Lansing's commercial suffers from five major problems: obsolescence; mixed land uses, "ribbon" and "four-corner" development; through traffic disturbance; and a general lack of adequate parking facilities. To solve these problems and in attempting to avoid their recurrence in the future, existing shopping centers should be refashioned and new ones built to modern standards. New or refashioned shopping districts, as has been demonstrated in recent years, should have stores grouped together, with an ample supply of off-street parking and controlled access from all major streets. Desirably, commercial uses should not develop, as many have in the past, with stores strung out along major streets or located on all four corners of an intersection. Such arrangements cause inconvenience and hazards for shoppers, fail to provide adequate parking, and result in poor business for merchants and poor investments for property owners.

It is now considered preferable to group commercial uses in an integrated center with sufficient depth of property to provide for parking, and otherwise so designed to allow for safe and expeditious movements of traffic. A typical "planned shopping center" is shown on Plate 16 (See page 75 of the Master Plan).

In problems such as this, it is the policy of the Planning Board to recommend service roads parallel with major streets or adequate building setbacks which would provide for service roads in the future.

In this case the property would have to be redeveloped as the commercial establishment is built to the ROW of Logan Street.

There is an inadequate front yard setback of the building for safety vision along Logan St. at this site.

The commercial development to the South provides an adequate setback and the same setback should be maintained to the North along Logan Street.

Pictures were presented to the Board showing the setback.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-163-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Edward F. Tank, to rezone a parcel at 1319 Massachusetts St., from "B" one family to "C" two family be granted.

The lot area meets the requirements of the proposed zoning ordinance, which is unique in the area.

The change would provide a transition between the elementary school to the South and the single family to the North.

The site has ease of access to a major street.

Conversion of this older home will increase the value and provide an increase in housing supply which is needed.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-164-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Reynolds, that the petition by Joe D. Pentecost, Marvin H. and Doris C. Moore to rezone a parcel at 4312 Collins Road from "A" one family to "F" commercial district be tabled for thirty days for further discussion.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-165-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Charles E. Bovinette, to rezone a parcel at 204 W. Grand River from "C-2" to "D" apartment be denied.

The site has less than the minimum area required for a two family dwelling.

On October 10, 1963 the Board of Zoning Appeals denied a request for a variance from the lot area requirements on this lot No. 1320.

Overcrowding of families into dwellings designed for single family use is a basic cause of blight.

The site is too small to provide the minimum required off-street parking.

If granted, this change would establish a precedent and could lead to further requests for conversions of dwellings in the area.

Mr. Fink stated that it was unfortunate that this house was well constructed and wondered if perhaps we could indicate that if adequate parking could be provided, maybe it could be worked out. Other houses in the area might be acquired and could be of economic value.

Some discussion following on where the parking should be provided on the owners land or somewhere in the neighborhood.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-166-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Audley A. Schnepf, a/k/a Buster Schnepf to rezone a parcel at 4312 S. Cedar Street and 412 E. Cavanaugh Road described as:

East 148 feet, excepting S. 50 feet of Lot 15, Supervisor's Plat No. 2, Lansing Township, now City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan,

West 12 feet of West 49 feet of Lot 18, Supervisor's Plat No. 2, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one family to "J" parking and "F" commercial district be denied as filed, and that the

Southerly 110 ft. of Lot 19 of Supervisor's Plat No. 2

be zoned "F" commercial and that the

North 45.53 ft. of Lot 19, Supervisor's Plat No. 2, and the East 49 ft. of the North 50 ft. of Lot 15, Supervisor's Plat No. 2

be zoned "J" parking with screening along the lot line described as:

Beginning 25 ft. South of the N.W. corner of Lot 19, thence South along the West line of Lot 19, 100 feet, thence West 49 ft., thence South 50 ft. to the point of ending

Screening to consist of one of the following:

A dense privet hedge of a height of 5 ft.

A 3 ft. high chain link fence with dense evergreen plantings of a mature height of 5 ft. to 5 ft. 6 in.

A 5 ft. high chain link fence with interwoven redwood slats.

Any other screening as may be suggested by the petitioner with approval of the Planning Board.

Zoning of the entire site would permit further encroachment of a non-residential use into a residential area.

Change of zoning of the entire property could deter the improvement of the adjacent properties to the South and West.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-167-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the petition by Mildred N. Beale, to rezone a parcel in the 2800 block of North Grand River Ave. described as:

Commencing on the southerly line of the 100 ft. ROW of Grand River Ave. at a point S. 68° 26' E. 10.13 ft. from the intersection of said ROW and the N. and S. ¼ line, thence S. 68° 26' E. 270 ft. thence S. 21° 34' W. 397.6 ft. to the north bank of the Grand River, thence N. 45° 37' W. 292.9 ft. along said bank, thence N. 21° 34' E. 284 ft. to the point of beginning in Section 5, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, also

Comm. on the southerly line of the 100 ft. ROW of Grand River Ave. at a point S. 68° 26' E. 280.13 ft. from the intersection of said ROW and the N. and S. ¼ line thence S. 21° 34' W. 170 ft. thence S. 68° 26' E. 167 ft. thence North 21° 34' E. 169.45 ft. thence N.W'ly 167 ft. on an arc to left whose chord bears North 68° 15' W. 167 ft. to the point of beginning in Section 6, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from residential "A" one family to "D-1" professional office district be tabled for thirty days.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

STREETS COMMITTEE

S-14-66

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that Mr. Karl Kessler, developer, be notified that the Preliminary Plat of Delray Manor was approved subject to the following conditions:

1. All lots should be platted with a mini-

mum width of 60 feet at the building line.

2. Lots 14 and 15 should be redesigned and oriented to the cul-de-sac at the end of Belaire Ave. A plat restriction prohibiting access to Logan Street should appear on the face of the final plat.

3. Final plat should be developed with all public improvements as required by the Michigan State Plat Act and the Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

4. Construction and Improvement drawings should be submitted and approved prior to approval of the final plat.

5. All required easements should be recorded on the face of the final plat.

6. This approval shall expire November 22, 1967.

Mr. Kressler asked if he might be allowed to speak?

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Rules of Procedure be suspended so that Mr. Kressler might be allowed to provide additional information.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Kessler related this is the nicest way anyone has said "No" like saying they have approved what I have requested. Your approval is by, I believe I heard, was based on a 60 ft. minimum. We originally came in with a 50 ft. lot, and after having that turned down we resubmitted it to bring the lots up to 58 ft. except for four of them which were on the circle and those were 60 ft. and I believe the lots that were on the corner was 65 feet. We have just so much land. You can divide it up so many ways and you don't come up with 60 ft. without the loss of an additional lot. We are willing to lose one lot to bring it up to 58 feet, however, we were unwilling to lose 2 lots, for this lack of 2 feet on a few of the others and I say unwilling, I speak of that in connotation with the existing laws. There is no one in the Planning Department or in the City Attorney's Office who was able to show me any requirement for other than a 50 ft. lot by the City of Lansing. I hear the term "City Policy" or "It is our policy" whether they are referring to the Board, the Planning Board's policy or the City of Lansing's policy, but no one has shown me anywhere in writing where it states we must have a 60 ft. lot. We feel we have complied with the state law, with our first plat and our compromise plat which brought it up to within 2 ft. of this arbitrary figure that someone has picked out of the air. Permit me to say, that I am not questioning the fact that perhaps the 60 ft. lot is a desirable thing, if it is so desirable then it should be a factual requirement, then I feel it should be in writing so that we people and the taxpayers and the citizens should know what we can plan on. We come in to the Planning Board and say I would like to put on a plat and

they say this complies with the law, however, it is against the unwritten policy. If there is a policy, I would be grateful if some of you know where it says this in writing. I checked with the City Attorney and he was unable to show it to me. I asked Mr. Guernsey's Staff on numerous occasions to show me where it is in writing that a lot had to be 60 ft. Now we are within 2 ft. of 60 ft. on all the remaining lots, but some of them are 60 ft., and we are within a couple of feet of being all the way around to the 60 ft. It is not our purpose to quarrel or fight progress and good planning, but I don't feel that anyone here would say whether 58 ft. was good and 60 ft. was better, 50 ft. is what the law says. We are in excess of the law by some 8 ft. and for you to pass on this motion as you have read it here tonight in effect, is a defeat and a turn-down of our plat. It costs us two lots. We are willing to compromise with the Board and go one lot, and I would like to respectfully request that this Board act in accordance with the law and not in accordance with someone's arbitrary figure that, if I may be pardoned with the expression, "Ivory Towered" idea of what something should be or an ideal. It doesn't fit in with the economics of the situation and we are trying to make a compromise of the ideal and economics by resubmitting this with 58 ft. lots and we feel we are entitled to some consideration.

Mr. Fink asked the Secretary. The 60 ft. platting, has been the result of our recommendation to Council for the Subdivision Regulations has it not?

Mr. Guernsey replied, that the Council itself has actually established the 60 ft. policy many years ago. The city has based all of their assessments for sewer systems, property assessments, etc. on this 60 ft., but it is true that it is not a written ordinance requirement. This Board has supported the 60 ft. and in accordance with it, whenever a developer comes into the office, we recommend in accordance with the Council policy of lots not less than 60 ft. This is not written into any formal subdivision regulations.

Mr. Fink asked the Staff then, if the two lots that are in question on Logan St. were designed into with a 58 ft. minimum, how would this work out? Mr. Fountain replied that this would be still contrary. The plat was shown to the Board. Mr. Fink then asked if the 70 ft. corner lot is in accord with Councils ruling and was advised that we have always widened the corner lots, but there is no definite width established, but it might vary as to where it is located. This is near a major thoroughfare and the more space available the better. Mr. Fink then commented that the Staff's recommendation has none of the lots wider than 60 ft. except the corner lots. Further discussion followed on setbacks, etc.

Mr. Black mentioned the hearing the Board had set up for January 17, 1967, and that he felt that the recommendation here

is reasonable and should go to Council in this form.

Mr. Manz stated that he didn't feel that the Board, asking for 60 ft. was necessarily arbitrary, but 60 ft. is the minimum established by State Law which doesn't mean that we are bound to that.

Mr. Kessler then stated that he appreciated the code the city is coming up with, but this is something needed a long time ago. If we needed a code, we should have one. The point is, if the people we have elected to pass our laws, don't pass the laws, that it is not the function of a higher city employee or a Board of your own type to make those laws, we have a law right now—the city has agreed to accept the state plat act. They have no specific recommendation other than 50 ft. and I don't believe it is the function of the city organization, and again I am not trying to be argumentative, but is it the function of a non-educated, non-legislative body to pass laws, and the Planning Board is in effect, trying to legislate these rules by their administration of them.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

S-2-66

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black that the Board notify City Council that the Board approved the Final Plat of Assessor's Plat No. 56 a subdivision of a part of the N. $\frac{1}{2}$ of the S. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 33, T4N, R2W, and recommends that it be approved by City Council.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

ROW-25-66

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the Board recommend to City Council that the Board recommends after considering the letter from Richard J. Abood, Attorney for Ramada Inns, Inc. of Lansing, Michigan offering the city a strip of land sixty-six (66) foot wide to be named Ramada Drive, that the deed be accepted subject to the following conditions:

The posting of financial security in the amount of:

| | |
|----------------------|-------------|
| Storm Sewer | \$ 8,400.00 |
| Sanitary Sewer | 9,740.00 |

| | |
|------------------------|-------------|
| Grade and Gravel | 2,360.00 |
| Curb and Gutter | 2,700.00 |
| Black Topping | 2,100.00 |
| Total | \$25,300.00 |

No occupancy permits be issued until such time as a final plat is recorded.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

SS-10-66

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the Board adopt a proposed amendment to the Major Street Plan of the Comprehensive Master Plan.

The Technical Coordinating Committee, of the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission has adopted standards or streets and roads within the Tri-County area, and this has been used as a basis for the standards adopted by the Lansing Planning Board.

The detailed, "Functional and Cross-sectional Characteristics" are being prepared in chart and graphic form for inclusion in the Comprehensive Master Plan.

The classification of streets and the public right-of-way widths adopted shall be not less than the following:

| | |
|---|-------------|
| a. Freeway | 300+ ft. |
| b. Expressway | 200-300 ft. |
| c. ParkwayVaries (minimum 120 ft.) | |
| d. Major Arterial | 100-175 ft. |
| e. Minor Arterial | 100-120 ft. |
| f. Collector | 86-100 ft. |
| g. Local | 60-66 ft. |
| h. Cal-de-sac | 50-66 ft. |

Minimum street surfacing widths shall be as follows for the particular street classification type:

| | |
|-------------------------|-----------|
| a. Freeway | 48-72 ft. |
| b. Expressway | 48-96 ft. |
| c. Parkway | 48 ft. |
| d. Major Arterial | 48-60 ft. |
| e. Minor Arterial | 48-60 ft. |
| f. Collector | 44-48 ft. |

| | |
|---------------------|------------|
| g. Local | *22-36 ft. |
| h. Cul-de-sac | *22-36 ft. |

*In case of low density residential development (2 or less housing units per acre) the local or cul-de-sac paving width may be lowered to 22 feet, where, in the judgement of the Planning Board this width will be sufficient to accommodate the anticipated traffic volumes of the overall neighborhood. Added street pavement widths and thickness may be required for local streets which are designed to serve high density residential developments and commercial and industrial subdivisions.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

BUILDINGS AND PROPERTIES

BP-14-66

Motion by Manz, seconded by Fink, that the Consumers Power Co. Tourway be tabled to December 6th for further study. Mr. Brown gave a synopsis of the information orated to the Board to date and of future items the Board might want to consider.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

BP-15-66

Motion by Manz, seconded by Black, that the Grand River Riverwalk proposal be tabled to December 6th for further study.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

BP-16-66

Motion by Manz, seconded by Fink, that the Board recommend to City Council after considering the letter from Alice Dillingham from the Harold M. Davis, Inc. organization proposing to sell to the City of Lansing for park purposes, approximately five acres of land located on the south side of East Jolly Road immediately west of premises owned by the Board of Education which premises are approximately 500 feet west of the intersection of East Jolly Road and South Cedar Street, that the acquisition of a park site be pursued as recommended by the Park Board at its November 9, 1966 meeting, "provided agreement can be reached with the owners of the proposed site."

Some discussion followed on whether or not it might be a good idea to consider both this and the Consumers Power Tourway to the South at the same time.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Gaus, that the original motion be amended to include:

This park be developed concurrent with the Consumers Power Tourway.

Motion on the amendment carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Original motion with the amendment carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. Reynolds advised that the Urban Renewal No. 2 has not received federal funding as yet. Community College is concerned. President Gannon has proposed that a delegation be sent to Washington to show the Capital complex with the Central City Plan, and to give a complete report on the city. This may have some effect on getting the project approved.

Some discussion followed on the possibility of splitting Urban Renewal Project No. 2 to allow Community College to get under way.

Community College is asking action to assure them that they will be allowed to cross Washington Avenue at the Community College level.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Mr. Guernsey stated that we are getting all the reports from the various agencies and expect to have them all in by the end of next week. The chairman will be called next week for a formal hearing.

PLANNING DIRECTOR

On the statute on required votes to pass on zoning matters, the Zoning Ordinance has no requirements on the votes. The State Law has no requirements, however the Policy of Procedure stated that five are

needed for a quorum. Act 285 of the Michigan Planning Act stated that it takes 2/3 majority of the Board. Some discussion was held on what might be done.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Gaus, that a recommendation be obtained from the City Attorney.

On the meeting with the Traffic Board, some discussion was held on a date. Mr. Black suggested that the Secretary get together with Mr. Hayes and set up a date for a special meeting. The Board could be contacted by telephone.

On the zoning changes, the City Council has set two hearings.

On the Zoning Ordinance, the Chamber of Commerce and Industrial Committee is reviewing them with the Staff.

The Board was advised that two persons are leaving the Staff namely; Claus W. Boeckmann, leaving for a position with the State, and Marian E. Cook, who will be transferred to the Community Renewal Program on a full time basis. We still have an opening for a Planner IX, but so far there has been no applicant qualified to fill it.

OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

ROW-27-66

The petition from the residents in the Delta River Drive area was referred to the Streets Committee.

NEW BUSINESS

A resolution relative to maintaining city property was read to the Board. Mr. Fink suggested that the resolution be sent to the proper agencies. The Secretary informed the Board that the resolution must follow the Board's Rules of Procedure.

Motion by Mr. Black, that the matter be referred to the Building and Property Committee.

Meeting adjourned at 12:15 A.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

N/M

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, December 6, 1966

Meeting called to order at 7:45 P.M. by chairman Ramona Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—6.

Absent: Manz and Siebert—2.

HEARINGS

S-16-66

Mr. Vernon C. Fountain, Planner, gave an explanation of the area around the proposed Bradley Hills Subdivision which is located in the 3100 Block of S. Waverly Road.

Mr. Francis Fine, developer, was present to answer questions, but stated he wished to add nothing further.

Mr. Fink asked for a clarification on the changes recommended from the original plan. Mr. Fine explained that the Staff did not want lots facing Waverly Road, and that a 66 ft. right-of-way was needed rather than the 60 ft. He believes that aesthetically the backing of the lots to Waverly is not good, it might be as far as planning is concerned.

Mr. Guernsey explained why the Staff had requested the 66 ft. ROW.

Mr. Fine added that the Lansing Association of Home Builders will ask for a meeting, as they feel this request for a ROW is excessive.

Mr. Black asked what the property on the southwest corner, listed as an exception, is? Mr. Guernsey explained, that they were split from the original track of land. Mr. Black then suggested that Mr. Fine check on the feasibility of building on Lots 59 and 60.

Mr. Fine stated that the lot pattern approved by the Board may have to be revised.

Mr. Leonard McConnell, 3718 Starlight Lane, asked several questions about the type of dwelling, the size of the lots, side

yards, the sq. footage of the houses proposed, etc. He then stated that they are working people who have nice homes and invested highly in them. They didn't want any lower priced houses in the area. He is against anyone building homes that would cause the valuation of their home to be lowered. He suggested that the homes conform to the houses in the neighborhood and also the size of the lots be increased. He felt his savings might be jeopardized if this project were allowed in the neighborhood.

Mr. Cullen Dubose, 214 Huron St., representing the Trinity AME Church, stated that they would officially like to go on record as opposing this project. The lots would be too small. People who own property in this area have refused to sell to developers. The Board of the church feel the lots should be of legal size as those in the area.

Mr. Fred Ford, 3700 Holmes, (not in telephone book) stated that the lot size is the reason for his opposing and presented a petition with 31 signatures. They want some restriction of 90 by 150 lot sizes, and also the square footage comparable to those in Woodmere Subdivision. (only 10 people who signed the petition were within the 300 ft. mailing distance of the subdivision).

About 12 people were in the audience who were interested in this subdivision.

Mr. Reynolds asked Mr. Dubose if the lots abutting their subdivision were larger, would this relieve some objections, and he replied that they all should be brought up to equal size.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

ZONING CODE AMENDMENT HEARINGS

SS-11-66

Mr. James A. Church, Planner, read the proposed amendment to Section 36-5.2 relative to the removal of topsoil, etc.

Mr. Fink asked if it was the intent to have a Council hearing only or would it be necessary to have one before the Planning Board? Mr. Fink was informed that the Planning Board normally has a hearing

and it would be required that the City Council have a hearing.

Mr. F. Merrill Wyble, Attorney, appeared for the Fiser Supply Co., and asked for an explanation of the proposed ordinance and further asked if this was the purpose to control the type of operation such as Mr. Fiser had or only for small type of excavating. He felt it was for the smaller type of operations. Fiser Supply has been in operation for several years and it appears to be likely to go on for several more years. A gravel pit will not necessarily be the same after several years of excavation. He further mentioned that it does not say in the ordinance that they could request a hearing before the Planning Board. On the temporary permit, they wouldn't want to have to renew it every 30 days or so and to level it off at the expiration of each permit.

Mr. Guernsey explained that this would be in the industrial classification and as such would be normally permitted use.

Mr. Fink asked the size of the area. Mr. Fiser stated that there are about 5 acres under water and the total operation covers about 30 acres. Industrial is all around this.

SS-12-66

Mr. James A. Church, read the proposed amendment to Section 36-5.2, relative to off-street parking in the "D-M" multiple district.

Mr. Fink mentioned that parking seems to be a problem with some convalescent homes and wondered if this requirement wasn't too high, with private clubs and lodges he wondered if parking space for employees have been considered? Feels there is a need for service employees parking, also there is a need for fraternities and sororities employee parking.

Mr. Black stated that he agreed with Mr. Fink that obviously the homes for elderly do not provide space for each employee, and most of the people in the homes do not have cars, however, during visiting hours the lots are always filled. He would like the addition of employee parking space added to the next five categories.

Mr. Guernsey stated the Staff will check this over and report back to the Board.

SS-13-66

Mr. James A. Church read the proposed amendment to Section 36-28 relative to off-street parking in the "D" apartment district.

Mr. Fink stated that he was concerned with space for the employees. He would like a definition of the usable floor area. He suggested that experienced funeral homes might be able to give the Staff suggestions

as to how much parking is needed for this. He further mentioned that parking for employees at hospitals is a serious matter. There is a real need for parking for these people.

SS-14-66

Mr. James A. Church read the proposed amendment to Section 36-30 relative to off-street parking in the "D-1" professional offices district.

SS-15-66

Mr. James A. Church read the proposed amendment to Section 36-45 relative to the side yard requirements in the "C" two family district.

Mr. Black questioned the advisability of the deletion of the wording:

"on each side of the building"

and stated he would like to recommend that these words be retained in the "C" two family amendment.

Mr. Fink stated he would like the addition:

"providing the minimum size of the lot is met"

SS-16-66

Mr. James A. Church read the proposed amendment to Section 36-46 relative to side yard requirements in the "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

SS-17-66

Mr. James A. Church read the proposed amendment to Section 36-47 relative to side yard requirements in the "D-M" multiple district.

There were no comments on the proposed amendment.

SS-18-66

Mr. James A. Church read the proposed amendment to Section 36-47.1 relative to the side yard requirements in the "D-1" professional offices district.

ZONING PETITIONS

Z-190-66

Mr. Kenneth W. Weaver, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone a parcel in the 300 block Fenton Street described as:

Lots 85 and 86 Jessop Home Gardens Subdivision

from "A" one family residence to "C" two family district. Mr. Weaver stated that he knows this property is in the middle of an "A" one family district, but feels that these are rather low cost houses. To build a new one family house here would not market well. He wants to build something that will rent well. He presented photos of the houses in the area.

Mr. Reynolds asked if he anticipated using it as one lot? Mr. Weaver stated that there was a photo of it included with the others, and that he intends to have two ranch style two family dwellings.

Mr. Fink asked if he were aware of any other two family houses in the area, and was advised there were none to his knowledge. He is only 4 lots from commercial zoning. The square footage of each will be 24 ft. x 52 ft., and they will be two bedroom units. They will be operated with a stairway in the middle, will be very sound and will have privacy. The driveway would be in the middle and about 20 ft. in width. The two pine trees he would like to keep. Parking facilities would be to the rear.

Mr. Fink mentioned the required parking spaces as recommended to Council by the Board.

Mr. Melvin Barnes, of 301 Fenton St., stated that the size of the lots make them too large for one family and feels they would warrant two family. He added that just east of this was a three family use, however, it is now used for two family.

Mr. Fink asked if directly west is the gas station and was advised that it is.

Mr. Barnes stated that he would go along with the two family, adding that he owns other property in the area. He felt there is enough room for parking. The utilities are in and there are trees for shade.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-191-66

Mr. Paul V. Spagnuolo, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property in the 5200 Block S. Logan Street, described as:

North 26.7 ft. of Lot 46, Supervisors Plat of Prosperity Farms

from "J" parking to "F" commercial

East 50 ft. of Lot 17, Supervisors Plat of Balzer Subdivision

from "A" one family to "F" commercial

W. 75 ft. of the E. 125 ft. of Lot 17 of Balzers Subdivision

from "A" one family to "J" parking.

That portion of Lot 13 included in the following described property:

Comm. at the S.W. corner of Lot 14, Supervisors Plat of Balzer Subd. thence N.E. to the N.E. corner of Lot 13, thence W. 150 ft. to the N.W. corner of Lot 14, thence S. along the W. line of Lot 14, to beginning,

from "J" parking to "F" commercial district. Mr. Spagnuolo stated he would like the 26 ft. zoned for parking. This will be needed to fit in with future building plans. He has 15,000 square feet of building now. On the space 75 ft. x 66 ft. could have two lanes of cars. 40 ft. would allow one row of cars. He has 33 ft. drive on Lot 14. S.W. corner to East corner of Lot 13 is "J" parking and other lot in back, facing Balzer developed with all single family homes are 66 ft. He purchased the back part and will install fence. The reason for commercial is for storage of equipment and a travel trailer.

Mr. Fink asked if the structure on Lot 47 is close to the curb, Mr. Spagnuolo advised that this was not his property.

He presented a chart of his proposed plans.

Mr. Fink suggested that the plans be presented to the Zoning Committee.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-193-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone a parcel in the 2800 and 2900 block Averill Drive described as:

Lots numbered 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 180, 181, 182, 197, and 198 Scotsdale Subdivision No. 2.

from "A" residential to "C" two family district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-194-66

Mr. Cassius Street, Attorney, appeared for Jack Dykstra Ford, Inc. in behalf of the petition to rezone a parcel in the 1200 block of West Holmes Road described as:

Commencing on the North section line of Section 32, T4N, R2W, Ingham County, Michigan 246.34 feet west of the northeast $\frac{1}{4}$ post of the N.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ corner of said Section 32, thence south 322 feet, thence west 200 feet, thence north 322 feet to the north section line, thence east 200 feet to the point of beginning,

from "J" parking to "F" commercial district. Mr. Street advised that the original plans did not show what this parcel would be used for and so was zoned "J" parking. It has been used for parking cars. The business has expanded now, and they would like to use it for a truck display and sales area. Planned improvements would include black-topping, installation of lights, and a small sales building similar to used car sales area fronting on Logan St. It would be approximately half way between Holmes and the property to the South. Mr. Street then told of the uses in the area.

Mr. Reynolds asked about the setback on Holmes, and was informed that they would accept the Boards recommendation.

Mr. Fink asked, concerning the property to the west, is there construction equipment stored on it, and was advised that there is. There will be no residence affected by this use.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-195-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 401 W. Ionia and 225-27 N. Walnut Street from "D-M" multiple and "D" apartment district to "D-1" professional offices district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-180-66

Mr. Marvin Dewald, appeared in behalf of his petition to rezone property at 4806 S. Logan Street, from "A" one family to "F" commercial, and stated on the back parcel he wishes to place his sound business facing Briarfield. He objects to multiple dwelling as it would be inadequate for his business. He does not want to integrate, would like two or three dignified offices retaining a separate building. He would landscape and would like the entire lot rezoned. He has been here 16 years and feels that it is a nice community. At present it is unsightly and feels that the area will be more up-graded than it is at present. He interviewed the five nearest owners of property and presented a statement signed by them stating they had no objections to this business. He feels 90% of the people on the circle would sign.

Mr. Reynolds asked, if he could get by without commercial, and was advised that he wanted office space in the front and his business in the back. They prefer to have one tenant in the front, but will allow a maximum of three. He must have commercial for his own business.

Mr. Reynolds then asked, if he sold at retail, and was advised that he did, but they

do not invite foot traffic. They have commercial equipment and use three trucks. Mr. Reynolds, then mentioned the Board's policy on Logan Street concerning commercial uses. Mr. Dewald advised he would cooperate with the Board.

Mr. Fink, asked if he intended to break ground immediately, and was advised that he did not and he was not impatient, however he was operating at a disadvantage now and very inefficiently. He feels this is not a site for a home. The present houses and office will be removed.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Recess from 9:13 to 9:55 P.M.

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that the minutes of November 1st and November 15th be approved.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-192-66

A public hearing was set for Tuesday, December 20th, 1966 at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1, for property at 3206 Aurelius Road. This Community Unit Plan is submitted by Estate Property Purchasers Investors Co., Inc.

S-15-66

A public hearing was set for Tuesday, December 20th, 1966 at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1 for a preliminary plat of Sunset Hills No. 6 submitted by Francis N. Fine.

S-17-66

A public hearing was set for Tuesday, December 20th, 1966 at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1 for a preliminary plat of Eppic Acres submitted by Jack Tysman.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-168-66

Motion by Fink, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Arlene A. Sheibels to rezone a parcel at 4711 S. Logan Street, from "A" residential district to commercial district be denied as filed, and that the petitioner investigate possible development of a Community Plan. The basic parcel meets the minimum area requirement and with the addition of the odd shaped parcel to the east, it is conceivable that a project compatible to the area trends could be developed.

This land abuts and is opposite land being developed for multi-housing.

There is no commercial zoning in this block on either side of the street. A converted barn used for sales purpose is a non-conforming use.

If zoned as requested the district would become what is known as a "spot-zone". Spot zoning is in direct conflict to zoning purposes, the spirit, and the intent of the enabling acts.

The area being petitioned for does not have a large capitalization in buildings. Proper zoning now is important.

Once zoned commercial the value of the land would be enhanced, and the variety of uses to which it could be put would be broad.

Lansing's Master Plan has a guide line that applies to this situation. Commercial area should comprise integrated groups of stores rather than string developments along major streets.

It is the Boards policy to discourage strip commercial development along this area of Logan Street.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-169-66

Motion by Fink, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Victor C. Anderson, Attorney, for Munger Electric Corp. to rezone a parcel at 5341 S. Pennsylvania Ave. corrected to 5351 S. Pennsylvania Ave. from "A" one family residential to "G-2" wholesale be denied as filed, and a portion of Lots 51 and 52 of Battenfield Subdivision described as:

Beginning at a point on the North line of Lot 51 which is 30 ft. East of the Northwest corner of Lot 51; thence South 90 feet; thence East 70 feet; thence North 90 feet; thence West to the point of beginning

be rezoned from "A" one family to "G-2" wholesale, and that

The remainder of Lots 51 and 52

be rezoned from "A" one family to "J" parking with screening along the North 95 feet of the East line of Lots 51 and 52.

Screening to consist of one of the following:

A dense or privet hedge of a height of 5 feet.

A three foot high chain link fence with dense evergreen plantings of a mature height of five feet to five feet six inches.

A five foot high chain link fence with interwoven redwood slats.

Any other screening as may be suggested by the petitioner with the approval of the Zoning Committee.

Due to the commercial nature of the immediate area it is not reasonable to assume that the property will be used under its present classification.

The "J" parking as recommended is consistent with other changes of zoning, which provides for proper set-backs and adequate off-street parking.

Mr. Reynolds asked if this would allow for the proper setback, and was advised it would be consistent with the setback to the North.

Mr. Guernsey advised that the Staff had also discussed the property to the North, Lots 49 and 50, which are non-conforming and asked if the Board would consider granting the owners a hearing as a prerequisite to rezoning.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Heino, that a letter be sent to the property owners of Lots 49 and 50 of Battenfield Subdivision notifying them that the Planning Board will hold a public hearing on their property tantamount to rezoning, Tuesday, January 20th, 1967 at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-170-66

Motion by Fink, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Lawtis W. Norman, to rezone a parcel at 4000 block Burchfield, described as:

"Lots 51 through 67 Meadow Wood No. 1"

from "A" one family residence to "C" two family district be denied.

This change would be a spot zone in the center of an established single family district of modest homes which are presently upgrating.

This change would alter the character of the neighborhood. Each lot would contain

two families or double the number of dwelling units per acre. This would in turn double the number of automobiles, the amount of traffic on the streets and could double the number of school children in the area.

The potential upgrading of the existing modest development along Burchfield could be stymied by the increased density, traffic and activity which would result from the change.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-171-66

Motion by Fink, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Mattie Lea Atwater, to rezone a parcel at 617 E. Miller Road, from "A" one family to "F" commercial be denied as filed, and the property be zoned "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

On April 2, 1964 the Planning Board recommended that the property adjacent to the North of this site be rezoned from "E-2" drive-in to "A" one family. This recommendation was to discourage further encroachment of non-residential uses toward the east. Since that time there have been changes of zoning and land use in the area that make it reasonable to assume that the subject property will not develop in single family.

The Board believes that the logical move in this situation would be toward a transition zone, which would minimize the adverse influences and pressures between the existing commercial development in the area and the potential residential development to the North and East.

The Board believes that a proper transition in this case would be a zone that permits low density multiple family development.

The Board further recommends that the property owners adjacent to that portion of Joshua St. which is unimproved, petition the City for street improvement.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-172-66

Motion by Fink, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Richard Geisenhaver to re-

zone a parcel at 700 Banghart Street, from "B-1" residential to "J" parking district be denied as filed, and that

All that part of Lot 7, of Banghart Subdivision except the South 25 feet of the East 30 feet

be rezoned from "A" one Family residential to "J" parking district, with screening along the following line:

Beginning at the Northeast corner of Lot 7, thence South 108 feet; thence West 30 feet to the point of ending.

Screening to consist of one of the following:

A dense, privet hedge of a mature height of five feet.

A three foot high line fence with dense evergreen plantings of a mature height of five feet to five feet six inches.

A five foot high chain link fence with interwoven redwood slats.

Any other screening as may be suggested by the petitioner with approval of the Zoning Committee.

The change would be a transition between the commercial use on North East Street and the single family homes to the East.

The change would relocate some of the commercially oriented traffic movements to the intersection of Banghart and North East Street.

The change would provide for needed off-street parking.

This recommended change of zoning would prohibit parking within the required front yard in accord with the residential zoning and development to the East, and still allow proper ingress and egress to the site.

Mr. Black asked for the reason for the South 25 ft. of the East 30 ft.?

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-173-66

Motion by Fink, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by John Tyler, to rezone a parcel at 400 S. Butler Blvd., from "C-2" family to "F" commercial district be denied.

The property owners have been before the Planning Board, City Council and the

Board of Zoning Appeals requesting commercial use.

On October 6, 1965 the Planning Board considered a change of zoning for this site and recommended denial for the following reasons:

The Board feels that efforts should be made to discourage development which may ultimately result in an area becoming commercially developed in a strip fashion. This reduces initially the carrying capacity of the roadway because of frictional movements which slows traffic. Ultimately because of the increasing traffic volumes and the need for elimination of curb parking upon which the activity relies, economic starvation of the commercial enterprise occurs.

City Council concurred in this recommendation December 21, 1964.

An appeal was filed December 31, 1965 requesting use of a portion of the residence as a barber shop. This request was denied by the Appeals Board May 6, 1965 for the following reasons:

Supported by an opinion of the City Attorney, it was found that this request was not within the jurisdiction of the Appeals Board.

This site has not been adversely affected in any way, by either land use, or zoning changes since the previous determinations and recommendations which would justify an amendment to the Zoning Code.

The Board further believes that the site is too small to support any type of commercial development, and provide for adequate off-street parking, and too small to provide adequate distance from adjacent residential development to protect the residences from the adverse influence of a commercial use.

The Central City Plan indicates this area to be developed in multi-family two story townhouses.

The Board further recommends that the applicant consider locating within the blocks bounded by Logan, Hillsdale, Butler and St. Joseph, which has been recognized for commercial development.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-174-66

Motion by Fink, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Richard Geisenhaver, to rezone a parcel at 6000 Keyes, from "A" one residential to "C" two family district be denied.

Proposed land use for this area is low density residential.

The established land use pattern in this area is single family residential.

The properties are so located that the structures can be oriented to the interior residential street. (Kyes Road)

This change of zoning would create an isolated district and encourage other developers to seek the same privilege for similar properties throughout the city.

There are no substantial reason why the property cannot develop in accord with the existing regulations.

"C" two family zoning is generally considered as a transition zone between unrelated land uses, such as commercial and single family residential.

Developers have indicated that they do not have difficulty marketing single family lots when located at the intersection of a residential street and a thoroughfare, providing the structure can be oriented to the residential street.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-175-66

Motion by Fink, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by J. B. Grammatico, to rezone a parcel at 1027 N. Walnut St., from "C" two family to "D-M" multiple district be denied.

Land use in the area is predominantly one and two family homes. Any change to a higher density would be out of character with the neighborhood.

The location of the site does not meet the general criteria for apartment zoning.

The existing sewer facilities in this vicinity are inadequate to sustain an increased density of development at this time.

Rezoning of the parcel would create an isolated district unrelated to similar districts, i.e. this would be a "spot-zone."

This rezoning would exceed the density proposed for this area on the Master Land Use Plan. (10-20 dwelling units per net acre).

If this rezoning is granted it will be difficult, if not impossible, to deny similar changes on adjacent or nearby properties, thus defeating one of the basic purposes for which the zoning ordinance was adopted, to implement the Master Plan.

On March 2, 1965 the Planning Board recommended denial of a request by the same petitioner to rezone this property to "D-M" multiple dwelling. On May 17, 1965 City Council concurred with the Board's recommendation. On October 21, 1965, the petitioner filed suit against the City of Lansing, for the rezoning of this property. This case is pending trial in the Ingham County Circuit Court.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-176-66

Motion by Fink, seconded by Heino, that the petition by Alvin L. Pickett, to rezone a parcel at 2020 William Street, from "B" one family to "C" two family district, be tabled thirty days for additional information as requested by letter from the petitioner.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-179-66

Motion by Fink, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Manley V. Meddaugh, to rezone a parcel at 4617 N. Grand River described as:

Lot 4 except that portion of said Lot 4 lying North of and adjacent to a line 50 feet South and parallel to the centerline of trunk line US 16, Plat of Westmont Subdivision, of a part of the East half of the northwest quarter of Section 6, T4N, R2W, in the City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" residential to "F" commercial be denied as filed and that the

South 30 ft. of Lot 4,

be zoned "J" parking, and

The balance of the property

be zoned "F" commercial.

Petitioner alleges that use has been commercial for 20 years.

Entire block fronting on Grand River Ave. between Alfred and Andrew Streets with its accompanying parking facility qualifies as a neighborhood shopping area.

Frontage of the complex does not conflict with adjacent single family residential.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Heino, that the Board notify the property owners of Lots 1, 2, and 3 Westmont Subdivision, that the Planning Board will hold a hearing January 3rd, 1967 tantamount to rezoning their property, from "J" parking to "F" commercial.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-180-66

Motion by Fink, seconded by Heino, that the petition by Marvin DeWald, to rezone a parcel at 4806 S. Logan St., from "A" residential to "F" commercial district be tabled for thirty days based on testimony earlier this evening.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-181-66

Motion by Fink, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Harold W. Davis, agent for owner, to rezone a parcel in the 1500-1600 W. Mt. Hope Ave. described as:

Commencing at the Southeast corner of Boston Boulevard and Mt. Hope Ave. and running thence S. 89° 24' 30" E.; 100 feet on the South line of Mt. Hope Ave., thence 50° 35' 30" W. 170 feet to the point of beginning of the following described parcel:

Thence S. 0° 35' 30" W. 60 feet, thence N. 89° 24' 30" W. 50 feet; thence N. 0° 35' 30" E. 60 feet, thence S. 89° 24' 30" E. 50 ft. to the point of beginning

be rezoned from "J" parking to "F" commercial district.

Commencing at the North ¼ Post of Section 29, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, running thence N. 89° 24' 30" W. 360.0 feet and S. 0° 35' 30" W. 180.0 feet to the point of beginning of the following described parcel:

Thence S. 0° 35' 30" W. 100.0 feet, thence S. 89° 24' 30" E. 102.4 feet to a point 260.0 feet from the N./S. line of said Section 29, thence Northerly 100.0 feet parallel with the N./S. ¼ line thence N. 89° 24' 30" West to the point of beginning

be rezoned from "F" commercial to "J" parking be granted.

The Planning Board further recommends that the

North 40' of the West 40" of the following described parcel:

Commencing at the north ¼ post of Section 29, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing,

Ingham County, Michigan, running thence on the Section line north 89° 24' 30" West 90 feet, thence south parallel with the $\frac{1}{4}$ line 180 feet to the point of beginning of this description, thence North 89° 24' 30" West 745.27 feet, to a point 100 feet east of the east line of Boston Boulevard, thence South 100 feet, thence South 89° 24' 30" east 745.27 feet, thence North 100 ft. to the point of beginning

be rezoned from "F" commercial to "J" parking district.

This will distribute pedestrian and vehicular traffic in the center more evenly thus enhancing its total utility to all shoppers.

It will also provide conforming zoning for all present land uses and eliminate the possibility of over extending the center.

It will serve neighborhood banking needs thus alleviating travel time and congestion on already overtaxed traffic arteries throughout the neighborhood.

Loss of parking space will be negligible, in fact space not fully utilized will be used to its optimum.

It should provide a long range stabilizing factor in retaining the shopping center as a neighborhood competitive complex in the expanding growth patterns beyond this area.

It is our intention that this change of zoning is to permit a walk-in bank, rather than a drive-in facility.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-182-66

Motion by Fink, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Paul Nelson, to rezone a parcel at 3015 S. Washington Ave., from "B" one residential to "F" commercial district be denied as filed, and the property be zoned "D-1" professional offices district.

The applicant has indicated that he would like a sign identifying the proposed use located within the existing front yard. This would not be allowed in the "D-1" office district.

The Board believes that due to the limited site distance at ingress and egress points along this area of Washington Ave., and considering the aesthetic qualities, the Board of Zoning Appeals should consider the request for the proposed sign.

The Board of Zoning Appeals could stipulate the conditions that would control the

location, size and lighting which would minimize any adverse affect on adjacent properties and traffic on Washington Avenue.

Land use and development has changed in this area, which has eliminated any possibility of expansion of the existing church.

It is indicated on the petition that the church has out-grown this facility and would like to relocate.

On-street parking along Washington Avenue during church activities indicates off-street parking is critically inadequate.

The proposed use would not be completely out of character with the existing uses in the area.

A professional office zone would allow the proper use and require provisions for off-street parking.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-152-66

Motion by Fink, seconded by Heino, that the petition by Joe D. Pentecost, Peter D. and John T. Laboda, to rezone a parcel at 909 W. Holmes Road, from "H" Industrial and "J" parking to "F" commercial district, referred back from Council, be tabled for thirty days or less, when and if the Staff are able to consult with the petitioner for a common meeting ground.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Amendments to Community Unit Plans

S-5-63

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that the Board recommend to City Council that the amendment to the Community Unit Plan of Village Square located at the N.E. corner of Miller and Haag Road be approved. This amendment consists of relocating the community building with off-street parking from its present location on Haag Road to the N.E. corner of Winterset and Haverhill Drive, Lot 29 of Village Green Subdivision. The approved plan now shows a four unit apartment building on this site. This new location is adjacent to the proposed park.

The Board believes that the proposed relocations will better serve the community development and being located adjacent to the park will bring the indoor and outdoor activities closer together, which many times compliment each other.

The Board further believes that this amendment is in keeping with the general intent of the Zoning Code, and will not have any adverse affect on the adjoining property or the general welfare.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

SS-2-62

Mr. Guernsey gave an explanation of the High Rise Tower plans as approved and mentioned the exceptions. They would like to add about 1500 sq. ft. of commercial floor area which would be exceeding the allowable 25%.

Some discussion was held on the additional parking needed.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Heino, that the amendment to the Community Unit Plan be tabled to December 20th for an additional parking area report and a Staff recommendation.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

STREETS COMMITTEE

ROW-27-66

Mr. Gaus stated that his committee would like to have their recommendation on the widening of Delta River Drive, tabled for 30 days for a report from the Staff.

Mr. Fink stated that he would like to have a traffic count.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. Heino mentioned the report, forwarded to the Board relative to the suggested amount to be included in the bond issue and asked for comments.

Mr. Reynolds stated that he thought the proposal was good. On the state trunklines, had been assumed that the city would carry the brunt, now it seems there will be federal and state aid. This would mean quite a savings if put in now. A number of things could be set aside, but would have to be done eventually, so he was in favor of going along with the general concept. Most of these things have been programmed.

Mr. Black stated, I would like to question the specific items at the top of the page two under "Bridges," which lists the Ottawa St. and Michigan Ave. bridges at \$800,000 each, with \$400,000 being the city's share of each. I don't believe the

bridges should be built as presently proposed because to my knowledge so far nobody knows what is going to happen to traffic past the east end of the proposed Ottawa St. bridge. I believe that should be programmed before the bridges are built and not afterwards.

The Council, in its wisdom, has stymied the extension of Allegan St. across the river by building the Grand Avenue ramp, so that if the Ottawa St. bridge is now built to accommodate west-bound traffic, there will be no compensating means to accommodate traffic going east. The traffic pattern to and from the Central Business District from E. Michigan Avenue will be like a man standing on one leg. It is quite possible that we might want to consider putting the Ottawa St. bridge on a diagonal across the river so that the approach to Ottawa S. from East Michigan would be similar to what we now have from East Kalamazoo to Washtenaw, where you come on River street at an angle and then either go north on Grand or west on Washtenaw. A similar approach to Ottawa St. might be arranged by placing the bridge on an angle which would take the west-bound traffic directly from East Michigan Ave. and funnel it on to Ottawa at Grand. Now, possibly, that might even be done by the widening of the Michigan Ave. bridge with a curved access to Grand on the west end instead of building the Ottawa St. bridge at all.

I am in favor of keeping the million six hundred thousand dollars for the total of these two projects in the budget, but I don't believe we should tie our hands by saying that it has to be spent specifically for the Michigan Ave. bridge and for an Ottawa St. bridge. I think they should both be combined in one project with some kind of a designation which would leave flexibility for the planning of a proper solution to the problem of traffic flow to and from the Central Business District and East Michigan Avenue.

Perhaps it could be called simply "New Bridges Across the Grand River," or "Access and Egress from the Central Business District" or some other wording.

In any case I would like to suggest that some sort of broader definition of what this "Bridge" money is going to be used for should be included in the wording of the bond issue rather than to tie it down to these two specific items.

Mr. Reynolds suggested that this should be included as a Council recommendation.

Mr. Heino asked if the Board would like to recommend a lower total figure?

Mr. Guernsey volunteered that this was last years Capital Improvements Committee recommendation and that it should be a unified package program to cover future growth needs. The Mayor Technical Coordinating Committee felt that this could not be reduced and meet our needs.

Mr. Gaus asked what if the cost goes up, and was advised that the costs had gone up 25% from last year.

Mention was made of the cutback on expressway funds.

Mr. Gaus asked for a construction time table and was informed that this will be furnished to the Board later with the new Capital Improvement Program. In the meantime, providing the bonds are approved, construction will take place. The bonding procedures may take up to six months.

Mr. Reynolds asked, concerning the millage, if it would be increased, and was advised that it wouldn't. Its effect on taxes will depend on several things. If Lansing is going to continue to grow it needs housing, traffic movement studies and sewers.

Mr. Gaus asked if this and the school board bond would be on the same ballot, and was advised that this is not intended.

Mr. Fink asked if the expenditures would be contingent on federal aid or state aid? He was advised that the bonds as sold must be for a stated purpose. Mr. Fink then asked where the city would stand if the federal program were dropped, and it was mentioned that it was the general feeling that the program will not change that much for the duration of the bonding.

Mr. Reynolds added that the Board must state a specific approach. He suggested that they add the recommendation as per Mr. Black's comments.

Some discussion was held on the clarification of the wording on the bonds.

Mr. Black asked if the land use costs were included and was advised that they were.

Some discussion was held on the Pleasant Grove extension and that the exact location was not determined as yet, also discussed was the US 127 extension from Michigan Avenue north, and how far North it was intended to go.

Mr. Fink stated he would like to set back the action date to December 20th in order to give the matter further study, and was advised that Council will be required to act before the 20th

Motion by Heino, seconded by Reynolds, that the Board recommend to City Council that they recommend the revised bond issue submitted to the Board by the Mayor's Capital Improvements Technical Coordinating Committee. This issue is a refinement of the bonding proposal recommended by the Board in February of 1966 to finance major projects for the 1966-72 Capital Improvements Program.

For several years the Board has been concerned with the diminishing funds available to finance needed Capital Improve-

ments. It appears from present revenues and expenditure projections that in the 1967 budget year there will be little or no funds available to finance Capital Improvements from general fund revenue.

In considering the recommendations of the Technical Coordinating Committee the Board suggests that the Ottawa Street Bridge project be changed to read: "Central City—Bridge." The Board believes that an additional bridge is necessary, however, that a detailed study to include traffic circulation east of the river and the approach into the Central City is needed before a bridge location is specified.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Fink asked about candidates for the position of Planner IX, and was advised that there is difficulty finding applicants because of the salary. Three or four persons have applied, but it was felt that they did not meet the qualifications required.

OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

Misc. 8-65

The letter from the Board of Education relative to the naming of a street "McCourt," was referred to the Streets Committee. Some discussion was held on the necessary steps to be taken before a recommendation could be made.

Mr. Black advised the Board that Mr. Guernsey had been made an honorary member of the American Institute of Architects. This was believed to be only the second time such an award had been given.

NEW BUSINESS

There will be a meeting of the Tri-County Planning Commission on Thursday, December 15th at 8:00 P.M. in the East Lansing City Hall, Council chambers. All members of the Board who could, were urged to attend the meeting.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Gaus, that a recommendation be made within the next thirty days as to what should happen to the Capitol. The city has a vital stake in the outcome. Some discussion was held on whether or not the recommendation should be referred to the City Council.

Meeting adjourned at 11:45 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

M

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, December 20, 1966

Meeting was called to order at 7:40 P.M.
by Chairman Ramona Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Manz
and Siebert—5.

Absent: Fink, Heino and Reynolds—3.

HEARINGS

S-15-66

Preliminary hearing of the proposed plat
of Sunset Hills No. 6. Mr. D. Gregory
Main, Planner, gave an explanation of the
area, land use and proposed use of the plat.

Mr. Reynolds arrived at 7:44 P.M.

Mr. Clyde Stephens, Surveyor, appeared
for Mr. George Byrnes owner, and discussed
his role in the platting of this area. The
area consists of 110 acres. Mr. Byrnes
lives on a portion of the unplatted area
and desires to plat the rest himself. It can
be served by all utilities. Sanitary sewers
are on Tecumseh River Road. The river
will provide storm drainage.

Mr. Black stated, "it appears that the
size of the lots are comparable to other lots
in the area."

Mr. Marion N. Stutes, 2002 Byrnes Road
questioned whether or not these lots were
as large as their subdivision to the North-
west?

Mr. Stephens replied, that Sunset Hills
when platted, may not have been in the
city and therefore developed without curb
and gutter. Without these improvements
the larger lots were platted.

Mr. Black stated, that the lots along
Northwest Street are shown as existing lots,
and not a part of this plat. These lots are
quite a bit smaller. Lots backing up to

Mr. Stephens advised, that Northwest
St. is a dedicated street and now public.
The houses now being built on the west
side of Northwest St. are on unplatted land.
This is proposed to be developed. Sewers
are built to accommodate lots as shown.

Mr. Reynolds asked if platted with 100
ft. lots, would the leads have to be recon-
structed? He was advised that they would.
Curb and gutter, gravel, etc. as proposed
here.

Mr. Siebert asked, if the lots presently
existing are on the west side of Northwest
St., and was advised that 14 are on both
sides and on the east side of Sunset Hills.
Mr. Siebert then added, that he didn't
think it looked out of proportion.

Mr. Russell L. Roe, of 1920 Byrnes Road,
stated that his lot is 90 ft. by 160 ft. and
he objected to the size of the lots proposed
in the new subdivision.

Mr. Stephens remarked that the size of
the lots is not as important as the value of
the homes being put on them. Thirty to
forty thousand dollar homes could be placed
on these lots.

Mr. Stutes asked, if the developer has
worked with Mr. Byrnes on the type of
homes? Mr. Stephens replied, that the city
has minimum standards and he assured
Mr. Stutes that Mr. Byrnes will not down-
grade or down-sell the area. Mr. Byrnes
has his home here.

Mr. Stutes then added, that Mr. Byrnes
had assured them before that he had not
intended to plat.

Matter was referred to the Streets Com-
mittee.

S-17-66 and Z-192-66

Mr. Ronald Gierthy, gave an explanation
of the location of the area, and the pro-
posed development of this Community Unit
Plan and Platting of Eppic Acres.

Mr. Jack Tysman, representing the Eppic
Corporation, presented maps to the
Board, and discussed the utilities, the sur-
rounding area and its public facilities.

Mr. Siebert asked, if they were keeping
a setback for the widening of Aurelius
Road, and was advised that the setback
from Aurelius Road is 50 ft. The right-of-
way now is 32 ft. They have been made
aware of this. They propose two story
structures.

A gentlemen who stated he lived on Ruth Avenue objected because of the crowding of schools. He believes there are enough taxes as is, and feels that taxes may be increased.

Mr. Merlin C. Babcock, 1832 Hoyt Avenue, stated that this borders his land, and tenants would be driving out on Hoyt to Aurelius. This will make it a dangerous area. On top of the hill is a steep incline and it is dangerous. If this is developed for multi-family, where are the play areas? He added that he was not notified of the plans until the notice from the Planning Board. Who pays for the sewers?

Mrs. J. L. Everett stated she owns property on Ruth Avenue, and mentioned the swamp to the South. She asked how the developer is going to put fill in and dig basements. The culvert is high. The drain needs to be deepened. The water near her home has been 2½ ft. deep. How is this problem going to be taken care of?

Mr. Tysman stated, that storm sewer is needed. This is a pretty fair area. It is more substantial than the area across the street. The sewer would be put in on petition unless the cost incurred by them.

Mrs. Everett then mentioned the muck and quick sand in the area.

Mr. Tysman explained that the play areas are indicated on the map. Under the "D-M" they could have 25 units per acre, with the Community Unit Plan, they have only 12 units per acre.

Some discussion was held on school needs in the area.

Mr. Tysman volunteered that the screening as required, would be abided by.

Mr. Gaus asked if the owner of the one family objected, and was advised that they did not. He has spoken to others in the area.

Mr. Reynolds questioned the commercial area, and was advised that there were no adverse remarks from anyone that it had been discussed with.

Mrs. Edward G. Gray, 3207 Ruth Avenue, asked how this would affect the neighborhood, because of the lake, this will draw people to the area. She doesn't think anything greater in saturation (density) should be allowed in the area. She asked the oBard to consider this.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-196-66

Mr. Ronald Gierthy, Planner, gave an explanation of the site, the land use and proposed use of the property at Pleasant Grove and Reo Road. This Community Unit Plan is presented by Francis N. Fine and the Bert Smokler Company.

Mr. George Foneville of Willow Park, an architect, appeared and stated that this is not a high density type of program. The living units are not in great number in any one building. Court yards are accessible from parking basis. All living units oriented away from interior courts. They will have Mansard roofs, face brick veneer to the second story. They believe it will be very pleasant. He stated that he is pleased to be part of the development.

Mr. Guernsey asked what the proposed time table for construction would be? Mr. Foneville stated that possible construction period could be within 90 days.

Mr. Leslie Verwey, 4707 Ingham, appeared in protest because of the population saturation. There are plans to widen Reo to four lanes to the edge of this property. There will be two extra lanes down Reo Road, will it dead end? The school on the East side of proposed plat, can handle approximately 50 children. There are possibly 300 children in the proposed project. There is not adequate storm sewer and the sanitary sewer may be too small. He has a petition to be presented. Mr. Gierthy quoted on the number and type of units proposed. He added that Reo Road is not planned for four lanes. It is proposed for a 30 ft. to 36 ft. pavement with a 60 ft. right-of-way. Three lanes may be maximum, however, it would be realigned.

Mr. Foneville, remarked that he had no information on sewers.

Mr. Wm. Mateer, Housing Director, stated that sewers will be provided to the area. The storm sewer will cross the park and the sanitary sewer will be extended from Reo Road Public Service Department considers this adequate. It is estimated there will be 200 school children. At the school across the street there are 25 less students this year. At Wainwright, there is a large increase over a year ago.

Mr. Verwey, asked about the lots being developed. He felt all the development will overtax the area.

Mr. Bob Burley, 2700 Reo Road, presented a petition with 18 signatures. (5 of the signers were within 300 ft. of this property as per the Assessor's records) Mr. Burley advised that his house was built a year ago. Four more have been built near him. He wondered who would maintain this project.

Mr. Mateer, answered that the Housing Commission will manage and maintain the property. There will be a community building, maintenance area with an office and a resident maintenance person plus office staff so someone will be there all the time.

Mr. Guernsey asked about the dedication of right-of-way, and was advised that it is 50 ft.

Some discussion on the right-of-way or ROW easement of Reo Road followed.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Recess from 8:50 to 9:16 P.M.

BUSINESS SESSION

S-1-63

Preliminary hearing on Forest Park Subdivision was set for Tuesday, January 17th, 1967 at 7:30 P.M. 6th Floor of City Hall.

ZONING COMMITTEE

SS-2-62

The amendment to the Community Unit Plan for the High Rise Tower at Pine and Ottawa Street was discussed.

Z-152-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Joe D. Pentecost, Peter D. and John T. Laboda to rezone a parcel at 909 W. Holmes Road, from "H" Industrial and "J" Parking to "F" Commercial be denied at this time, for the following reasons:

1. For clarification of the present congestion at Washington and Holmes such that it demands further study.
2. Haphazard solution is temporary at best for through traffic on Holmes Road with commercial traffic generation has been proposed.
3. Site is extremely small for proposed land use and there is little land available for parking. Zoning request and its proposed use could be justified if more land were available.
4. The Planning Board strongly urges that steps be taken immediately to dispose of the 76 ft. ROW to the East of this zoning change request, and further that this ROW acquisition would enhance the development of the subject property.
5. That the Planning Staff prepare a total approval to the realignment of Washington Avenue and Holmes Road. The resultant traffic problem in view of the eminent commercial development of the large open land areas known as the Tepsich property demands that the Planning Board consider these solutions at this time.

Mr. Guernsey informed the Board that the Staff have worked with the Traffic Engineer on a traffic pattern that would permit this project.

Some discussion followed concerning barriers and traffic circulation.

Mr. Black stated that the access to the property would be only one lane in one direction. It is not very desirable for a business. He didn't see where it would do the developer much good and probably would drive the customers away.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-164-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Manz, that the petition by Joseph D. Pentecost, Marvin H. and Doris C. Moore, to rezone property at 4312 Collins Road, from residential "A" to "F" commercial district be tabled to January 3rd.

Some discussion was held regarding this action.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-167-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Manz, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Mildred N. Beale to rezone a parcel in the 2800 block N. Grand River Avenue described as:

Commencing on the southerly line of the 100 foot right-of-way of Grand River Avenue at a point south 68 degrees, 26 minutes east 10.13 feet from the intersection of said right-of-way and the north and south $\frac{1}{4}$ line, thence south 68 degrees 26 minutes east 270 ft., thence south 21 degrees 34 minutes west 397.6 feet to the north bank of the Grand River, thence north 45 degrees 37 minutes west 292.9 feet along said bank, thence north 21 degrees 34 minutes east 284 feet to the point of beginning in Section 5, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan,

also

Commencing on the southerly line of the 100 ft. right-of-way of Grand River Avenue at a point south 68 degrees 26 minutes east 289.13 feet from the intersection of said right-of-way and the north and south $\frac{1}{4}$ line thence south 21 degrees 34 minutes west 170 feet thence south 68 degrees 26 minutes east 167 feet thence north 21 degrees 34 minutes east 169.45 feet thence northwesterly 167 feet on an arc to left whose chord bears north 68 degrees 15 minutes west 167 feet to the point of beginning in Section 5, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from residential to "D-1" professional district be denied. Platting or an overall development plan should precede any zoning.

This would add to the strip mixed-use development along North Grand River Avenue.

The Master Plan indicates this area as residential.

The intermixture of strip commercial development along major streets creates traffic congestion and the use itself detracts from planned commercial centers.

If used as proposed, in the new zoning ordinance the developer would be permitted to consider the area in flood plain for purposes of computing density and the flood plain would be protected from adverse development.

This is part of the area that was given approval for residential development under a Community Unit Plan. The Board believes that this use of the land should be upheld.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-200-65

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Manz, that the Board recommend to City Council that the Community Unit Plan by Eugene F. Zelmet of the B. L. Smokler and Company, for a parcel at the south side of Miller Road at Haag described as:

E. $\frac{1}{2}$ of N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of W. $\frac{1}{2}$ of N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of N.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ N. of N. R/W line I-96 exc. com. 757.25 ft. E. of N. $\frac{1}{2}$ post N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$, thence E 220 ft. S. 394 ft. W. 220 ft. N. 394 ft. to beg; Section 8, T8N, R2W,

be extended for one year from February 14, 1966 when Council approved. The Board further recommends that all previous conditions of approval remain in effect.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

S-16-66

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that Mr. Francis N. Fine, developer, be advised that the Preliminary Plat of Bradley Hills is approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Final Plat to be developed with all public improvements as required by the Michigan State Plat Act and Lansing Subdivision Regulations.
2. Construction and improvement drawings should be submitted and approved prior to approval of the final plat.
3. Street right-of-way should be 66 feet with 36 foot pavement, except the Westerly 170 feet of Malibu Drive which may be 60 feet wide.
4. A plat restriction prohibiting access from residential lots to Waverly Road should appear on the face of the final plat.
5. All lots should be graded so that storm water shall drain therefrom.
6. This approval shall expire December 20, 1967.

Mr. Reynolds asked if the lots on the North side of Starlight Lane are wider? Did the Committee consider this? He was advised that the developer will meet city standards.

Mr. Fountain advised that the surveyor had questioned the right-of-way on Averill Drive, and the 60 ft. right-of-way was acceptable to all departments concerned.

Mr. Gaus suggested that perhaps there should be an addition to the conditions limiting a 60 ft. right-of-way on Averill.

Mr. Guernsey stated that he thought the Board should support the city policy of a 66 ft. right-of-way.

Mr. Manz agreed that all roads in the plat are 60 ft. and lead into Averill which is also 60 ft.

Mr. Guernsey mentioned that the Board of Education would have to be contacted and the owners for an additional 6 ft. of roadway to be dedicated.

Mr. Fountain mentioned that the road has already been improved with curb and gutter. Sidewalks are installed.

Mr. Black added that it doesn't have to be put on the center of the right-of-way. Mr. Black then asked if Averill is part of this development?

Mr. Guernsey answered that part of Averill is.

Additional discussion followed.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

S-13-66F

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz, that the Board approved the Final Plat of Rensen Center and the Board recommends that it be approved by City Council subject to the following conditions:

1. All public improvements shall be installed with complete public utilities including water, sanitary sewer, storm sewers and full street improvements including street paving, curb and gutter, sidewalks and such other improvements as required under Section VI of the Lansing Subdivision Regulations.
2. Certification of the engineering specification requirements by the Board of Public Service.
3. Posting of financial security as determined by the Board of Public Service prior to the signing and affixing of the municipal seal.
4. All monuments being installed in accordance with the requirements of the Michigan State Plat Act.
5. All other standards and requirements of the Michigan State Plat Act, Act 172, Public Acts of 1929 as amended shall apply.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

BUILDINGS AND PROPERTIES

BP-14-66

Motion by Manz, seconded by Reynolds, that the Board approve in principle, the acquisition by lease of certain parcels of Consumers Power Company right-of-way for recreational purposes and recommends that Council approve the park concept described as:

| Description | Acreage |
|---|---------|
| A strip of land 165 ft. wide lying W. of and adj. to W. line MC RR R/W across E. $\frac{1}{2}$ Section 3, T3N, R2W, Lot 32 | 16.06 |
| S. 40 A. of that part of N.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ lying W. of MC RR R/W exc. S. 40 ft. R. and exc. a 10 R. strip of land W. of and adj. to MC RR R/W Section 3 T3N, R2W, Lot 42 | 7.49 |
| Com. on N. and S. $\frac{1}{4}$ line 825 ft. N. of cen. Section 3 the N. 125 ft. W. 150 in. S. 125 ft. E. 150 in. to beginning. Section 3, T3N, R2W, Lot 45 | .43 |

| | |
|--|-------|
| N. 10 ft. R. of W. 50 R. of N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ exc. land used for street purposes. Lot 72 | 8.05 |
| N. 10 ft. R. of S. 50 R. of N.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ exc. land used for street purposes. Section 4, T3N, R2W, Lot 38 | 9.59 |
| N. 10 R. of S. 50 R. of N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ Section 4, T3N, R2W. Lot 100 | 9.12 |
| Maple Grove Farms Subd. No. 3, About 180.8 ft. x 200 ft. Lot 156 | 3.34 |
| Maple Grove Subd. No. 3 About 116.5 ft. x 230 ft., Lot 157; | |
| Maple Grove Farms Subd. No. 3, About 100 ft. x 303 ft., Lot 158; | |
| Maple Grove Farms Subd. No. 3, About 100 ft. x 335 ft., Lot 159 | 2.08 |
| Creyt's Subdivision—NW'y 250 ft. of Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 also com. W. corner of Lot 6, the SE'y 325 ft. on SW'y line of Lot 6, NE'y to point on NE'y line Lot 6, 438 ft. SE'y of N'y corner Lot 6, NW'y to N'y corner Lot 6, SW'y to beg. Also S. 3 A. Lot 9 | 9.47 |
| N. 10 R. of S. 50 R. of W. $\frac{1}{2}$ of N.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ E. of M-99 R/W Section 5, T3N, R2W. Lot 230 | 2.98 |
| Com. 660 ft. N. and 1181.4 ft. W. of E. $\frac{1}{4}$ post Section 5, the N. 165 ft. W. 138.6 ft. to E. $\frac{1}{2}$ line Section 5 S. 165 ft., E. to beginning, Section 5, T3N, R2W, Lot 17 | .53 |
| Com. 660 ft. N. of E. $\frac{1}{4}$ Post Section 5 the W. 1181.4 ft., N. 165 ft., E. 1181.4 ft. S to begin, Section 5, T3N, R2W, Lot 21 | 3.78 |
| Maple Grove Farms No. 1, Lot 15 about 132 ft. x 660 ft., and the S. 33 ft. x 660 ft. of Lot 14 | 2.50 |
| Maple Grove Farms No. 1, Lot 16, 132 ft. x 701.5 ft., and S. 33 ft. x 701.9 ft. of Lot 17 | 2.50 |
| S. 165 ft. of S.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ Section 6, T3N, R2W, Lot 380 | 4.88 |
| N. 165 ft. of S. 190 ft. of S. $\frac{1}{2}$ of S. $\frac{1}{2}$ of N.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ Section 6, T3N, R2W, Lot 220 | 9.88 |
| Total | 92.68 |

The Planning Board further recommends that necessary actions be taken to secure a lease or leases with Consumers Power Company to utilize the recreational potential. The land described is approximately four miles long and 165 feet wide.

The right-of-way still is in a natural state. It is contiguous to four existing or future school sites, and is in close proximity to seven other sites.

Due to the constantly growing need for open space, to enhance the urban environment, and to create and maintain beauty and order. It is desirable to secure and develop this space.

Tentative meetings have been held with officials of the Power Company and it has been determined that a lease is feasible and desirable from their standpoint.

The entire right-of-way should be treated as a unit, thus, a walking trail or "Tour-Way" could be created to traverse the city from Waverly Road on the west, to the sanitary landfill (programmed to become a golf course) on the east. Portions of the land could be allotted to specific educational projects.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

BP-15-66

Motion by Manz, seconded by Reynolds that the Board approve the location, character, and extent of the Riverwalk as presented by the Mid-Michigan Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, with the provision that the Grand Avenue parking ramp exit to Washtenaw Street be retained and incorporated into the Riverwalk plan. The Riverwalk will be constructed on both sides of the Grand River from Michigan Avenue to Kalamazoo Street.

Mr. Black asked for a report on additional studies. Mr. Brown showed the board drawings made by students and mentioned the right-of-way. The city will be arranging with the landscape architect for working drawings.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

BP-17-66

Motion by Manz, seconded by Reynolds, that the Board advise City Council that they concur with the action of the Park Board regarding the sale of certain city owned land as listed:

1. Part of West Side Park
(69,330 sq. ft. @ \$184,000)
2. Part of Hunter Park
(24,280 sq. ft. @ \$29,500)
3. Stabler Park Parcel
(4.7 Acres @ \$278,000)
4. Mifflin St. Parcel
(0.57 Acres @ \$2,200)

5. S. Francis St. Parcel
(43,172 sq. ft. @ \$9,200)

6. Regent St. Parcel
(75,360 sq. ft. @ \$6,900)

This makes a total of approximately 10.14 acres to be sold for \$509,800, and the acceptance of certain State owned land in partial payment as listed:

1. C. S. Parcel No. 33045-215
(18.375± Acres @ \$60,000)
2. C. S. Parcel No. 73113-174
(11± Acres @ \$2,750)
3. C. S. Parcel No. 23151-32 and 33
(9± Acres @ \$4,000)
4. C. S. Parcel No. 33045-S-201, C-207
(38± Acres @ \$57,000)
5. C. S. Parcel No. 33084, 110, 111, 112, BW
(44± Acres @ \$66,000)
6. C. S. Parcel No. 33035-C-63
(33± Acres @ \$9,900)
7. C. S. Parcel No. 33084-97-98
(33± Acres @ \$9,900)

and the recommendation on the use of the remainder of cash difference due the city.

About 166% acres of land is being offered amounting to \$221,650 in exchange for park land of about 10 acres.

The Planning Board further recommends that City Council place this proposal on the ballot.

This would mean that Hunter St. would be completely closed, however, the Parks Department may be able to use part of the funds for a new roadway, possibly a city service road north of I-496.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

SS-3-66

Motion by Manz, seconded by Black, that the Board recommend to City Council that the application for Federal Funds to acquire land within the Red Cedar Basin for open-space purposes be approved, and acquisition of the land when if funds are available, be authorized.

The application has been completed at Council's request as a joint effort of the Park and Recreation Board and the Planning Board.

The land in question is briefly described as that part of Section 23, T4N, R2W, with-

in the Lansing City limits and lying south of the Red Cedar River, with the following exceptions:

1. The C. and O. and Grand Truck Railroad right-of-ways.
2. Two parcels of property already owned by the Parks Department.
3. All of Fidelity Farms Subdivision east of Fidelity Road.
4. The south 297 ft. of Fidelity Farms Subdivision west of Fidelity Road.

Estimated acquisition cost is \$482,967 including an assemblage factor and real estate costs. Because we are asking for a 50% Federal Grant, total cost to the City would be approximately \$241,483. Financing would be through the proposed selling of bonds.

It should be realized that this is an initial application and is not a binding agreement. Amendments to the application are acceptable after the date of filing.

Mrs. Linda T. Lund, gave an explanation of the location and boundaries of the proposed Red Cedar Park. The property in East Lansing would require joint action. Annexation could take too long and so would the process of voting, so this was excluded. It may be added as an amendment later. The total land area is 190 acres for \$484,000. \$408,000 for land acquisition (these figures are City Assessor estimates plus 15% assemblage factors.) The City's share will be 50% or approximately \$242,000.

Mr. Guernsey, informed the Board that this was included in the bond issue approved by City Council on Monday, December 19th.

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. Reynolds stated, that the Redevelopment Board had been authorized by City Council to take down all buildings possible and the vacant areas could then be used for parking.

ORDINANCE

SS-11-66

Motion by Black, seconded by Manz, that the Board recommend to City Council that Chapter 36, Code of Ordinance of the City of Lansing, Michigan be amended by adding a section to be numbered 36-5.2 to read as follows:

Section 36-5.2. In all districts except the "I" Heavy Industrial District, the use of land for the removal of topsoil, sand and/or other materials from the land, other than materials from basement public service or utility excavations, common household gar-

dening and the care and improvement of established home lawns or the development of public rights-of-way, is not permitted except under a temporary permit from the City Council. Requests for removal should be made in writing and filed with the City Clerk and shall be referred to the Planning Board and Public Service Board for study and report.

The recommendations of the Board shall be accompanied by a report stating the reasons for approval or denial of the permit.

Applications for permits shall be accompanied by a suitable site plan in triplicate, drawn to scale showing proposed and final grades. It must be established by the applicant that such removal will not:

1. Cause stagnant water to collect.
2. Leave the surface of the land in an unstable condition.
3. Leave the land unfit for growing turf.
4. Leave the land unfit for those uses permitted in the district in which such removal occurs.

After public hearing the City Council may deny or allow a temporary permit.

If allowed, the City Council may impose such conditions to the granting of the permit as in its opinion are necessary or desirable to assure or guarantee that such removal will not cause the above described effects.

Section 2. All ordinances or parts of ordinance in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Mr. Reynolds questioned if an area is zoned "I" do they have to get a permit and may they leave the land in any condition?

Mr. Black, answered that they would get a temporary permit on recently annexed property. It may be rezoned later.

Some discussion was held on the possibility of a zoning amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

SS-12-66

Motion by Black, seconded by Manz, that the Board recommend to City Council that Section 36-25 ("D-M" multiple district) be amended, by adding another paragraph to read:

The minimum number of off-street parking spaces by type of use shall be determin-

ed in accordance with the following schedule:

Housing for the Elderly: One for each two units, and one for each employee. Should units revert to general occupancy; then two spaces per unit shall be provided.

Homes for the aged and convalescent homes: One for each two beds.

Boarding and Lodging Houses: One for each sleeping room.

Institutions of the usual philanthropic or eleemosynary nature: One for each 300 square feet of useable floor space.

Private clubs and lodges: One for each three persons allowed within the maximum occupancy load as established by local, county or state fire, building or health codes.

Fraternity or Sorority: One for each five permitted active members, or one for each two beds, whichever is greater.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

SS-13-66

Motion by Black, seconded by Manz, that the Board recommend to City Council that Section 36-28 ("D" apartment district) be amended, by adding another paragraph to read:

The minimum number of off-street parking spaces by type of use shall be determined in accordance with the following schedule:

Funeral Homes: One for each fifty square ft. of usable floor space.

Hospitals: One for each one bed.

Clinics: One for each three hundred square ft. of usable floor area.

Motels: One for each one occupancy unit plus one for each one employee.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

SS-14-66

Motion by Black, seconded by Manz, that the Board recommend to City Council that Section 36-30 ("D-1" professional offices

district) be corrected, the first paragraph to read:

Whenever a structure is erected, converted or structurally altered for multiple-dwelling purposes, in any "D-1" professional offices district there shall be provided accessible parking space on the Lot, either garage or surfaced area adequate to accommodate ONE AND ONE HALF cars for each dwelling unit provided in the structure.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

SS-15-66

Motion by Black, seconded by Manz, that the Board recommend to City Council that Section 36-46 "C" two family district be corrected, the third paragraph to read as follows:

(3) **SIDE YARDS:** There shall be a side yard having a width of not less than ten per cent of the width of the lot, provided such side yard shall not be less than four feet in width, provided that lots of record at the time of passage of ordinance number 154 that were, at such time, forty feet or less in width may have a side yard of three feet (See Section 36-54 and 36-7).

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

SS-16-66

Motion by Black, seconded by Manz, that the Board recommend to City Council that Section 36-46 "D-M" multiple district be corrected, the third paragraph to read as follows:

(3) **SIDE YARD:** On ALL lots and for buildings not exceeding two and one-half stories in height the side yard shall be the same as required in the "C" two family district and this side yard shall be increased by two feet in width for three story buildings. (See Sections 36-54 and 36-7).

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

SS-17-66

Motion by Black, seconded by Manz, that the Board recommend to City Council that Section 36-47 "D" apartment district be corrected in the third paragraph to read as follows:

- (3) **SIDE YARDS:** On ALL lots and for buildings not exceeding two and one-half stories in height the side yard shall be the same as required in the "C" two family district and this side yard shall be increased by two feet in width for three story buildings. (See Sections 36-54 and 36-7).

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

SS-18-66

Motion by Black, seconded by Manz, that the Board recommend to City Council that Section 36-47.1. "D-1" district be corrected in paragraph three and should read as follows:

- (3) **SIDE YARD:** On ALL lots and for buildings not exceeding two and one-half stories in height the side yard shall be the same as required in the

"C" two family district and this side yard shall be increased by two ft. in width for three story buildings. (See Sections 36-54 and 36-7).

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Sebert—6.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. Guernsey advised that City Council has adopted a resolution putting the bond proposal on the ballot.

The Staff are working on the Capital Improvements Program for 1967-72.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Guernsey reported that delivery had been made of the department vehicle.

Work is beginning on the work program. The Board was asked for recommendations. These could be referred to the office or discussed at the next Board meeting.

Mr. Guernsey mentioned a class he attended at MSU, concerning a plan for Lansing's Central City Traffic problems which appeared to be critical in the next few years.

Mr. Black mentioned that the meeting with the Traffic Board should be in the last two weeks of January.

Some discussion was held on whether or not to try for the 24th or 31st for the meeting date. The Board is to be informed of the date.

Mr. Siebert asked for information for the Board's use at such a meeting.

Mr. Guernsey suggested that perhaps the Board would like to recommend to Council that a Traffic Consultant be hired to work on the Central City Areas.

Mr. Black, asked if it would be helpful to have the study made by the students available for this meeting, and he was advised that the Staff will try.

OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The Board were informed that the "Williamsburg Resolves" paper was included in the Staff report for the Board's perusal.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Black, complimented Mrs. Lund on her presentation of the Red Cedar Basin Study.

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

T/C